DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 647 CS 010 669

AUTHOR	Robbins, Edward L.; Thompson, Linda
TITLE	A Study of the Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library's Summer Reading Program for Children (1990).
INSTITUTION	Indiana Univ.-Purdue Univ., Indianapolis. Measurement and Evaluation Center for Reading Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.
PUB DATE	Apr 91
NOTE	85p.; For a 1989 report, see Ed 316 845.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; Elementary Education; *Library Extension; Low Achievement; Parent Participation; Program Effectiveness; Reading Achievement; *Reading Programs; *Recreational Reading; *Summer Programs; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Indianapolis Marion County Public Library IN; Reading Motivation

ABSTRACT

The Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library's summer reading program aims to help children develop a love of reading by giving them full control over what and how much to read. A study examined the effects of the 1990 program, with special attention to low-achieving students. A quantitative analysis was undertaken of 164 first- through sixth-grade students' pre- and post-test reading achievement in the reading program (together with 16 students who served as a control group) chosen randomly from the 4,000 students served by 9 branch libraries in the inner-city area of Indianapolis, Indiana. The descriptive portion of the study involved surveys and interviews of the 164 students, their parents, and the librarians from the 9 branch libraries. Seven low-achieving students involved in the quantitative portion of the study were selected as subjects for case study. Results indicated that: (1) students maintained their reading achievement levels over the summer, whether or not they were involved in the reading program; (2) the reading program attracted mainly average and above-average readers; (3) the incentives offered were effective but not necessarily linked to the amount of reading completed by the children; (4) participants enjoyed positive experiences with the public library; and (5) a notable proportion of participants reported visiting the library with parents or other family members and/or engaging in reading activities with family members outside the library. (Nine tables of data are included; participant and control group survey forms and results, parent telephone survey form and results, individual case study stories, and 41 references are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED335647

A STUDY OF
THE INDIANAPOLIS-MARION COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY'S SUMMER READING PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN (1990)

FINAL REPORT

FOR

LILLY ENDOWMENT, INC.
Indianapolis, Indiana

Conducted by
Dr. Edward L. Robbins and Linda Thompson
Co-Principal Investigators

Measurement and Evaluation Center in Reading Education

Indiana University School of Education

Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis

CS010669

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Linda Thompson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

April, 1991

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

A Study of the Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library's

1990 Summer Reading Program for Children

Table of Contents

Section Page

Executive Summary. 1

Purposes of the Study. 4

Context of the Study 4

Review of the Literature 7

Key Questions and Procedures in the Study. 11

Quantitative Study

- Sample of Students. 11
- Data Collection 13
- Findings from the Pretest-Posttest Data 15
- Summary of the Quantitative Study 19

Descriptive Study

- Participant Survey. 21
- Parent Survey 23
- Comparison of Participant and Parent Surveys. 25
- Interviews with Librarians. 26
- Other Descriptive Data. 28
- Summary of the Descriptive Study. 29

Case Studies of Low Achieving Readers

- Selection of Case Study Children. 31
- Data Collection 32
- Data Analysis 32
- Cross Case Analysis of the Case Studies 33
- Summary of the Case Studies 36

Study Findings 38

Limitations of the Study 41

Conclusions. 42

APPENDIX A -- Survey Forms and Results

APPENDIX B -- Individual Case Study Stories

APPENDIX C -- References Cited

A Study of the Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library's

1990 Summer Reading Program for Children

Executive Summary

Special library programs for children abound. Yet, few are likely to have been as successful in attracting participation as the Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library's summer reading program. This innovative program, initiated in 1985 to replace a more traditional summer reading model, is focused on a goal of helping children develop a love of reading. Primary strategies toward this end include giving children full control in deciding what is read and how much reading is done. Incentives are provided to reinforce each child's reading. The program is open to children of all ages -- birth through age 18 -- and adults may also participate by reading to children. Over the last five years participation in this summer reading program has increased 1,000 percent to almost 45,000 readers during summer, 1990.

The Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library's summer reading program is obviously successful in attracting participants, and it elicits questions about how this program contributes to the maintenance and improvement of children's reading performance. A pilot, quantitative study of the 1989 program and this more comprehensive quantitative and qualitative study of the 1990 program were undertaken to address those questions. The issues studied included whether or not participants in the program maintained their level of reading achievement over the summer, especially for low-achieving students, and the particular role incentives played in not only attracting participants, but in contributing to the amount and type of reading actually engaged in during the program.

A study of the summer reading program was conducted by the Measurement and Evaluation Center for Reading Education (MECRE) in the Indiana University School of Education at Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis. This study examined the effects of the program through the use of reading achievement measures, surveys, interviews, review of program data, and case studies.

The evaluation of the program's effects on **the maintenance of reading achievement levels** found that participants in the program as well as a small group of non-participants maintained their reading achievement levels over the summer period. These results did not appear to be linked to other factors such as the level of program participation and the amount of reading done in the summer reading program. Inferences drawn from these test comparisons can be challenged based on the appropriateness of a standardized achievement test as a measure of impact resulting from recreational reading, the short interval between the pretest and posttest, and the differences in the sample sizes. Thus, it is not possible to attribute the maintenance of reading achievement to participation in the program. Instead, this study adds credence to the widely-held view that standardized achievement tests are insufficiently sensitive to measure reading performance over short time periods such as a summer.

The Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library's summer reading program is designed to attract all children -- good and poor readers alike. But a special focus of this study was to examine **the effects of program participation on low-achieving students.** This study was conducted in areas presumed to have high concentrations of low-achieving readers and in a school district where 27 percent of elementary students receive remedial instruction. Despite the concentration and needs of these students, this study confirms previous research: it is difficult to attract the low-achieving student to recreational reading. According to data reviewed, this summer reading program attracted mainly average and above-average readers.

The **effectiveness of incentives** in attracting participants to the program was also confirmed by this study. Incentives are well-liked by the children and well-supported by parents and librarians. Based on the case studies portion of this research, the incentives received were not necessarily linked to the amount of reading completed by children. The case studies' data substantiated children's individuality as both readers and summer reading program participants.

Based on the data reviewed, it appears that, without exception, participants in the summer reading program enjoy **positive experiences with the public library** through their library activities. A public library's audiences are diverse and have varying ability to engage with books. Summer activities at the Indianapolis Public Libraries attempt to address this diversity through options such as a free summer movie series and a program of demonstrations/activities in addition to the summer reading program. These various offerings provide children and adults multiple opportunities for coming to the library. Summer reading program participants see the library as more than a depository of books. A significant portion of their participation in the libraries related to other activities and services such as attending movies, visiting with friends, and being in a safe, air-conditioned environment.

Participation in the summer library program provides **opportunity for family involvement**. A notable proportion of participants reported visiting the library with parents or other family members and/or engaging in reading activities with family members outside the library.

In general, the Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library's summer reading program for children continues to attract impressive numbers of participants, and participants clearly engage in a wide variety of library activities. Given the stated goal of the public library's summer program -- to encourage children to read and to develop a love of reading -- and the interest in promoting low-achieving children's recreational reading, several **recommendations** seem appropriate based on this study.

- Make more direct recruitment efforts to low-achieving readers in order to attract this hard-to-reach population's participation in the summer reading program.
- Consider additions and alternatives to the present summer reading program design in order to attract and encourage low-achieving readers' participation.
- Look for ways to make connections with low-achieving readers and potentially increase their engagement with out-of-school reading. Try to find avenues which show interest and significant support to these readers (e.g., by adapting the home/parent involvement component, or using teen or adult volunteers). Such efforts could capitalize on the public library's role as a non-threatening community institution.
- Pursue the research possibilities raised in this study. These include a comparison of summer reading program experiences at inner-city and non-inner-city sites, and an examination of the specific types of materials read and the substance of that reading (e.g., the reader's expressed enjoyment and level of understanding).

An extension of this study could examine how summer reading experiences relate to the reading experiences and expectations for students in their school reading instruction. The public library's summer reading program could adapt its internal evaluation process to address some of these issues. Others could be pursued through pilot projects within the summer reading program or through future research efforts.

Purposes of the Study

A well accepted assumption in education is that children learn to read by reading and by being involved in programs where there are meaningful opportunities to read. It is presumed that children who read and thus develop a love for reading will build a lifelong reading habit. In fact, these assumptions are borne out in research literature. Case studies of lifelong readers have found that an early interest in reading is common (Lockledge & Matheny, 1987; Duncan & Goggin, 1982) Adults who describe themselves as "active readers" or regular users of the public library report that their reading patterns were established early (Yankelovich, Skelly & White, 1978; American Library Association, 1978).

These findings underscore why it is important to be concerned with young children's development as recreational readers. If all children can be encouraged to read and learn to like reading as children, there is an increased likelihood that they will become adults who read and like to read. Such adults will be better prepared to participate as employable, contributing citizens.

This study focused on a public library's summer reading program which is attracting large numbers of children for the express purpose of encouraging them to read and enjoy reading. This inquiry is an attempt to examine the impacts and dynamics of that summer program. In 1989, a preliminary study was conducted to examine this program's impact on participants' reading achievement. That initial study focused on four inner city branch libraries and included a brief survey and pretest-posttest comparison for 44 participants in grades one through three. The study's major hypothesis was satisfied: participants in the Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library's summer reading program maintained the reading achievement levels exhibited at the time of the statewide achievement testing.

However, there were a number of questions which could not be explored in that first study due to the limited number of study participants and the data available to the evaluators. This second expanded study was suggested to examine factors contributing to the apparent success of this summer reading program. An additional five "neighborhood" (inner city) branch sites were added to the original four sites studied. The study also expanded to include grades one through six, and the number of study participants was enlarged. Subset foci in the new study were low-achieving readers within this population and parents of participants.

Context of the Study

For many years the goal of encouraging children to read and learn to love reading has served as the broad base for public libraries' summer reading programs. The Indianapolis-Marion County Public

Library has sponsored such programs annually since 1919 to offer children special opportunities for reading during the periods when they are not in school. Traditionally, these programs encouraged school-age children to read a predetermined number of books from certain genre or a selected list.

In 1985 the Indianapolis public library changed its usual summer reading program to include a menu of incentives tied to the number and types of books read, and participation in the program was expanded to include parents and preschool children. These revisions emphasized family literacy and proposed to reward all reading, not just those children who reached an externally established goal.

The procedures for this incentive-based program are straightforward. The participants receive "point cards" and earn points according to the number and type of books they read. These points range from five points for a preschool picture book to 25 points for a book from the librarian-selected "Bonus List of Accelerated Reading." Each participant can earn a maximum of 500 points during the summer.

Parents can register with their preschool children, and the parents earn points for reading to their children (as well as the children getting points for listening to the books.) School-age children earn points for their independent reading as well as reading they do with others, e.g., with a parent, sibling, or friend. Points are awarded based on an "honor system" -- it is assumed that participants request points only for the books they read. However, librarians occasionally ask children about the books when the children present their point cards. Such discussions were more common at some branch libraries than at others.

Participants can choose to save points or spend their dividends as they are earned. The points earned are exchanged for a participant's choice of items on a prize menu. These rewards are provided by corporate and foundation sponsors either directly or through funding which supported the library's purchase of the prizes. In 1990 participants had the following options as incentives:

Bookmarks	5 points
An ice cream cone	20 points
Sunglasses (cardboard)	35 points
Special pencils	50 points
Fast food french fries or hot dog	60 points
"Read, Read, Read" shoelaces	70 points
Fast food "chicken sticks"	80 points
A paperback book	80 points
A fast food "children's meal"	100 points

Adults participating in the program choose from among three prizes: a salad or a sandwich from a fast food restaurant or a nylon book bag.

The results of these changes have been dramatic. In the first year participation in the program increased over 400 percent, from fewer than 3,500 in 1984 to more than 14,000 in 1985. Summer reading program participation and children's book circulation have grown with each successive year. Comparing 1984 and 1989 statistics, summer reading program participation has increased over 1000 percent, and, on average, recent participants read three times as many books as under the previous summer reading program format.

The number of participants in the 1990 summer reading program followed the same increasing pattern observed during the last five years. In the 23 library sites throughout greater Indianapolis, a total of 44,273 children and adults participated in the summer reading program. This represents 15 percent growth over 1989's participation of 38,440. The ratio of participants was 78 percent children under the age of 18 and 22 percent adults.

This study focused on nine branch library locations in the inner city; these branches are termed "neighborhood libraries" because they are located in or near inner city residential areas. At these libraries in 1990 there was a 37 percent participation increase over 1989, from 4,710 to 6,476 children and adults. Their 17 percent rate of adult participation was slightly lower than the 22 percent registered in the total program, resulting in a slightly higher children's participation rate (83 percent) than the overall program.

From all appearances this is a popular and well-received program which is connecting children and books. Such a program invites study to learn more about its impact and dynamics with young readers.

Review of the Literature

A review of the literature was conducted to provide background for this study. This review centered on four relevant topics: summer regression of reading skills, family as an influence and support for reading, involvement with the public library, and the influence of incentives on recreational reading.

Loss of reading skills over the summer

Although the phenomenon of students' loss of reading skills over the summer is frequently reported informally by teachers and is a generally-accepted occurrence, there is relatively little research on this problem in the educational literature. Most of the reported studies focus on the effect of instructional intervention during the summer; only one study was found which directly measured the effect of a library summer reading program. The findings among the various studies did not produce a strong consensus about a summer reading regression effect.

Some studies indicated that, in general, summer regression is not a significant factor on reading achievement. In 1978 Perez conducted a study of 84 first through fifth graders who received no reading instruction during the summer and concluded that there was no significant loss in reading ability in that sample. McCormick and Mason's 1981 study of 66 kindergarten students similarly concluded that kindergarten children continue to progress in their knowledge about reading without formal instruction during the summer.

Studies of children who received summer reading instruction produced mixed results. A 1982-1983 New York City Public Schools' study and a 1985 Portland, Oregon summer school study both showed that students made gains. A 1982 study by Cornelius and Semmel and a 1984 Cortez and Hotard study found that students who received summer instruction had minimal or no loss of reading skills. A 1978 study funded by the National Institute of Education reported no loss of reading achievement and no significant differences between remedial and non-remedial students' achievement across the summer. However, a 1982 study funded by the U.S. Department of Education found that compensatory education students showed no loss but made less progress than non-remedial students. The results from the latter study were similar to results found in a 1979 four-year study conducted in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Studies of motivational reading programs which provided no direct reading instruction produced similarly mixed results. No discernible impact on reading achievement was measured in one study which provided ten instructional packets to be used at home. A 1981 program which gave free paperback books to first and second grade children showed statistically significant gains in vocabulary by first graders, but no significance with comprehension or with the second graders in the study. A 1976 study contrasting different types of summer reading activities showed that a program based on students' reading interests made significant gains compared to basal instruction or school-related activities.

The single study of a public library's summer reading program for children was done in Normal, Illinois, in 1984 and involved 279 students, grades two through six. A comparison of pretest-posttest scores for summer reading program participants and non-participants found that participants made a statistically-significant increase on vocabulary scores. It also concluded that the number of books read by children during the summer did not seem to be as important as the fact that the children enrolled in the summer reading program.

Overall, there does not appear to be clear evidence that reading skills are lost during the summer. However, most summer reading programs are predicated on the assumption that without the assistance provided by these programs, there would be a loss in reading achievement, particularly for low-achieving students. Success was often reported as maintenance of reading score rather than a gain in reading achievement. There was a wide variety in the contexts, variables, and findings among the studies reviewed; in the absence of more definitive evidence, any further conclusions of these data should be made cautiously.

Family as an influence and support for reading

The influence of the family and home literary environment has been a recurring interest in studies of children's reading for many years. Studies in the 1960s and 1970s often focused on relatively unchanging factors of home life. Coleman (1966, cited in Wigfield and Asher, 1984) found that home factors such as race, socioeconomic status, parental education levels, and parental occupation outweighed school factors in determining children's reading achievement. However, such effects of socioeconomic status on reading attitude and achievement are disputed in other studies (e.g., Hansen, 1969; Woolf, 1980; Taylor and Dorsey-Gaines, 1988).

While the relationship of socioeconomic factors and children's reading may be a debatable issue, the relationship between the home literary environment and children's reading is more broadly accepted. Hansen (1969) found significant relationships between the home literary environment and children's independent reading and attitudes toward reading. In the Hansen study, home literary environment was defined by the availability of literary materials, the amount of reading done with the child, reading guidance and encouragement given the child, and parents as reading models.

Corroborating support for Hansen's work is easily found in numerous studies. Becoming a Nation of Readers (1984) states that "reading begins in the home" (p. 21), and stresses the importance of home experiential and language activities as the developmental background for children's reading. Strickland and Taylor (1989) emphasized the importance of shared book experiences to early language and literacy development. Woolf (1980) found a positive correlation between the amount of reading parents did and their children's attitudes toward reading.

The National Assessments of Educational Progress (NAEP) provide additional data on the importance of family influence and support for reading. The 1980 NAEP gathered self-reported data about reading material in the home and demonstrated a positive correlation with reading achievement results (Walberg and Tsai, 1985; The Reading Report Card, 1985). Learning to Read in our Nation's Schools (1990) reported similar results from the 1988 NAEP and concluded "because better readers report reading more frequently and having access to a greater variety of reading materials, it is important to encourage young children to engage in a variety of reading experiences" (page 37).

In general, current research on the influence of the family as a support for reading focuses on the areas staked out in Hansen's study: the availability of literary materials, the amount of reading done with the child, reading guidance and encouragement given the child, and parents as reading models. These topics provide a frame for the qualitative data aspects of this study.

Involvement with the public library

Studies have shown that factors such as proximity to a public library and regular family visits to the library influence children's access to books and pattern of library use. It also appears that childhood habits of library use extend into adult life (American Library Association, 1978; Stronks, 1981; Thompson, 1984; Pablo, 1986). However, the most recent NAEP noted that elementary-school students make frequent use of the library, with two-thirds of these students responding that they take books out of the public library on a daily or weekly basis. The same study noted that as students get older, their reported use of the public library declined dramatically as evidenced by the majority of grade 12 students who said they "never" or "yearly" take books out of the library (Langer, Applebee, Mullis, and Foertsch, 1990).

Other evidence supports the use of the public library as an influence on young children's reading. Wigfield and Asher (1984) and Durkin (1982) cited parents taking children to the library as an influence on children's early reading. Greany (1980) cited public library membership as a positive correlate of leisure time reading for fifth graders. These findings seem to corroborate Kemp's 1982 finding that accessibility has a direct influence on the independent reading of elementary children. While it appears that the public library can be an influence on reading as well as a source of books and reference information, data regarding correlation between reading achievement, attitude toward reading, and public library usage are lacking and no conclusions can be drawn about such relationships.

The affect of incentives on recreational reading

A unique feature of the Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library's summer reading program for children is the use of incentive prizes for reading. As previously stated, the introduction of the incentives concept in 1985 had a dramatic impact on the level of participation in the summer reading program. Participation has continued to grow in each successive year of the program.

Apparently, the incentives offered in this program are effective at increasing children's summer use of the library in Indianapolis. A school's reading incentive program described by Dunne and McGrath (1985) reported similar success in increased readership. Johnston (1988) reported improved attitudes toward reading as well as increased amounts of reading after introducing a reward system to reluctant readers. In general, all studies endorse that incentives are effective in encouraging children to read.

Key Questions and Procedures in the Study

Six key questions framed this 1990 study of the Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library's summer reading program for children.

1. Do participants in the Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library's summer reading program maintain the reading achievement levels exhibited at the time of statewide achievement testing?
2. How does the reading achievement of the participants in the summer reading program compare to the reading achievement levels of similar students who do not participate in the summer reading program?
3. Who is attracted to an incentives-based summer reading program?
4. What level of parental involvement is noted in the summer reading program, and what are the apparent benefits of this parental participation?
5. What attracts and holds the low-achieving reader in the summer reading program?
6. What are the effects of reading incentives on the amount and type of reading done by low-achieving readers?

Three major approaches were used to answer these questions:

1. a quantitative analysis of the reading achievement change scores for participants selected from the summer reading program at the nine library sites, and a comparison of those scores with a control group of students from the same school areas who did not participate in the summer program;
2. a descriptive analysis of survey and interview data from children participating in the summer reading program, their parents, and librarians at the sites included in this study; and
3. case studies of seven low-achieving readers who participated in the library's summer reading program at the inner city libraries.

These three approaches serve as the organizational structure for this report. The procedures for selecting each sample of students, collecting data and analyzing the results are described separately in each section as that major portion of the study is discussed.

Quantitative Study

The first two questions framing this study were quantitative in nature and involved reviewing reading achievement change scores for a sample group of program participants and comparing those results with a control group of non-participants. The following principal hypothesis provided the basis for looking at the children's reading achievement:

> Participants in the Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library's summer reading program for children will maintain the reading achievement levels exhibited at the time of the pretest.

This assumption was two-pronged: (1) children who participated in the summer reading program would not show the assumed summer regression of reading achievement; and (2) non-participating children would be less likely to maintain their reading achievement levels. In answering the key questions, sample selection, data collection, and data analyses were the same for both the participant and control groups.

Sample of Students: Identification of the two samples for this part of the study began with a random sample of 4,000 students in grades one through six who lived in an area served by one of the nine libraries included in this study. This sample was limited to students from the Indianapolis Public Schools (IPS) for two reasons: (1) the preliminary study had shown that a great majority of students participating at these nine libraries were IPS students; and (2) the IPS Research and Evaluation Department agreed to provide pretest data on their students involved in this study.

In April a mailing was sent to each of the 4,000 names on this computer-generated list. This flyer described a study of summer reading (with no mention of the public library's summer reading program) and invited each individual to send back a signed parental permission form which granted permission for the child to participate in the study and made the child eligible for a prize drawing. A total of 801 signed informed consent forms were received as a result of this mailing. This was the initial pool for the participant and control groups.

Beginning in early June, this list of 801 names was checked against summer reading program registrations at the nine libraries to identify participants from non-participants (control group). A total of 105 names from this initial pool were identified as participants in this manner, leaving 696 potential names on the control group list.

The participant pool was also expanded as registration forms were reviewed. An additional 1151 IPS students in grades one through six who enrolled in the library's program but had not received the

April mailing were sent flyers about the study and permission forms inviting their participation. An additional 183 signed informed consent forms were received, and these names were added to the participant pool.

In July, a third procedure was used to enlarge the participant pool. Librarians were asked to distribute a flyer and permission form to IPS elementary grade children registering at the library. Five additional informed consent forms were received in this way.

Study plans called for testing of 600 children: 540 participants, and 60 in the control group. However, despite contacts to approximately 5500 children, a total of 293 children had been identified for the participant pool and 696 children for the control group pool. All 293 children in the participant pool were invited to take the reading posttest. Using the participant group's distribution by grade level as a base, a stratified sample of 200 students from the control group pool was also invited to take the test.

Children invited to take the posttest were mailed information about the date and time of testing. This flyer listed the individual incentive (100 bonus points to spend from the library's menu of prizes) and general information about a single grand prize drawing from those who took the posttest. In addition, the children invited to the posttest were telephoned several days before the test date to remind them about the study. Despite these efforts, it proved difficult to attract a large number of children to take a reading test during the summer. A total of 203 children took the posttest in early August, 1990. Of these, 156 were from the participant group and 47 from the control group.

From this group it was possible to obtain matched pretest and posttest scores on 190 children and to match pretest-posttest scores and survey results on 180 children: 164 reading program participants and 16 control group children. Although 47 children invited as control group showed up for the testing, it turned out that 29 of those children had enrolled and participated in the summer reading program at another branch library. Those children were included with the participant group rather than as control group students for data analysis purposes.

Data Collection

The participants' sample included 164 elementary grade students distributed in the following grade ranges:

First grade: 35
Second grade: 31
Third grade: 35
Fourth grade: 29
Fifth grade: 23
Sixth grade: 11

Three pieces of information were matched for each student:

1. a 16-item survey about their participation in the summer reading program;
2. pretest scores from the vocabulary and reading comprehension subtests of the Indiana State Tests of Educational Progress (ISTEP) or the California Achievement Test (CAT/E, 1985 edition) administered by the Indianapolis Public Schools in March, 1990; and
3. posttest scores from the vocabulary and reading comprehension subtests of the CAT/E, 1985 edition, administered in August, 1990.

The test data used were based on national norms; the ISTEP norm-referenced scores are the CAT/E national norms, and, thus, allowed for direct comparison of ISTEP/CAT pretest and CAT posttest scores. The same norms tables (QM26) were used to score the pretest and the posttest; gain scores are stated in terms of absolute gain.

The matched pretest-posttest data were compared for three scores: total reading, reading comprehension, and vocabulary. Six different scales were used to review gain scores:

1. objective mastery scores
2. number correct (raw score)
3. scale scores
4. normal curve equivalents (NCEs)
5. stanines
6. national percentiles.

Data were reviewed based on the total sample, each separate grade level, and whether students were first year or continuing participants in the program. Comparisons centered on students who maintained or gained in reading achievement compared to those for whom achievement losses were measured.

The comparison of the pretest-posttest and resulting change score data were analyzed through the application of a variety of parametric and nonparametric statistical procedures. These included:

Parametric procedures:

- Pearson Product Moment correlations
- Test for significance -- t-test
- Frequency distributions
- Means and standard deviations
- Standard error of measurement
- Variance
- Normality of distribution (mean, median, mode)
- Skewness and kurtosis
- Quartiles and semi-interquartile ranges

Nonparametric procedures:

- Wilcoxin Matched Pairs Signed-Ranks Test
- Scheffe's Test
- Sign test

Findings from the Pretest-Posttest Data

The results from the six different scales used to compare pretest, posttest, and change scores for both the participant and control groups were reviewed to test questions 1 and 2 of the study. Since there were only minor variations across the scales, the discussion of findings is focused on the mean national percentile results. In addition to having representative results compared to the other scales, percentiles are a common reporting metric and more likely to be understood than most of the other scales.

Participant Group's Data

Grade 1 Results

The pretest, posttest and change scores for the 35 first grade summer reading program participants are reported in mean percentile scores in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Test	Mean Pretest	Mean Posttest	Mean Change	Sig. ** (=> .01)
Vocabulary	68.1	74.1	7.3	
Comprehension	65.3	67.8	3.7	
Total Reading	67.5	71.3	5.1	

Pretest-posttest comparisons for Grade 1 students in the participant group showed no significant changes, thus reading achievement levels were maintained.

Grade 2 Results

The pretest, posttest and change scores for the 31 second grade summer reading program participants are reported in mean percentile scores in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Test	Mean Pretest	Mean Posttest	Mean Change	Sig. ** (=> .01)
Vocabulary	68.6	73.4	4.7	
Comprehension	72.1	68.1	- 3.4	
Total Reading	71.6	71.8	0.2	

Pretest-posttest comparisons for Grade 2 students in the participant group showed no significant changes, thus reading achievement levels were maintained.

Grade 3 Results

The pretest, posttest and change scores for the 35 third grade summer reading program participants are reported in mean percentile scores in Table 3.

TABLE 3

Test	Mean Pretest	Mean Posttest	Mean Change	Sig. ** (=> .01)
Vocabulary	56.3	56.6	2.5	
Comprehension	57.2	53.2	- 2.5	
Total Reading	57.7	55.4	- 0.6	

Pretest-posttest comparisons for Grade 3 students in the participant group showed no significant changes, thus reading achievement levels were maintained.

Grade 4 Results

The pretest, posttest and change scores for the 29 fourth grade summer reading program participants are reported in mean percentile scores in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Test	Mean Pretest	Mean Posttest	Mean Change	Sig. ** (=> .01)
Vocabulary	59.8	60.8	1.0	
Comprehension	59.4	59.3	- 0.1	
Total Reading	59.9	60.1	0.3	

Pretest-posttest comparisons for Grade 4 students in the participant group showed no significant changes, thus reading achievement levels were maintained.

Grade 5 Results

The pretest, posttest and change scores for the 23 fifth grade summer reading program participants are reported in mean percentile scores in Table 5.

TABLE 5

Test	Mean Pretest	Mean Posttest	Mean Change	Sig. ** (=> .01)
Vocabulary	60.4	61.6	1.2	
Comprehension	61.8	49.3	- 12.5	**
Total Reading	61.8	54.9	- 6.9	

Pretest-posttest comparisons for Grade 5 students in the participant group showed a significant decline in the comprehension score levels. However, for vocabulary and total reading, the change scores are not significant, thus overall reading achievement levels were maintained.

Grade 6 Results

The pretest, posttest and change scores for the 11 sixth grade summer reading program participants are reported in mean percentile scores in Table 6.

TABLE 6

Test	Mean Pretest	Mean Posttest	Mean Change	Sig. ** (=> .01)
Vocabulary	67.4	62.4	- 5.0	
Comprehension	63.2	49.7	- 13.5	
Total Reading	67.3	56.5	- 10.7	

In the absence of very dramatic change scores, the application of statistical tests to such a small sample (N = 11) is unlikely to produce significant results due to size limitations. Pretest-posttest comparisons for Grade 6 students in the participant group showed no significant changes, thus reading achievement levels were maintained.

Total Participant Group Results

The pretest, posttest and change scores for the 164 summer reading program participants in grades one through six are reported in mean percentile scores in Table 7.

TABLE 7

Test	Mean Pretest	Mean Posttest	Mean Change	Sig. ** (=> .01)
Vocabulary	63.0	65.2	3.0	**
Comprehension	63.2	59.5	- 3.0	
Total Reading	64.0	62.7	- 0.6	

Pretest-posttest comparisons of the scores for all students in the participant group showed a significant increase in vocabulary change score. Comprehension and total reading change scores showed no significant changes, thus reading achievement levels were maintained.

Control Group's Data

Total Control Group Results

Because of the limited number of children in the control group, there were insufficient data for grade level comparisons of the test results. The pretest, posttest and change scores for the 16 children who constituted the control group are reported in mean percentile scores in Table 8.

TABLE 8

Test	Mean Pretest	Mean Posttest	Mean Change	Sig. ** (=> .01)
Vocabulary	54.3	65.9	11.7	**
Comprehension	64.3	56.6	- 7.7	
Total Reading	60.0	61.8	1.8	

Pretest-posttest comparisons for students in the control group showed a significant increase in vocabulary change scores. Comprehension and total reading results showed no significant changes, thus reading achievement levels of the control group were maintained. Caution should be used in interpreting these scores due to the small number of children included in this control group.

Summary of the Quantitative Study

The comparison of reading achievement levels on the pretest (ISTEP/CAT scores, March, 1990) and the posttest (CAT scores, August, 1990) reflected a significant decrease in comprehension at Grade 5 of the participant group and significant increases in vocabulary for both the total participant and total control groups. However, in general, reading for all grades and for the total groups showed no significant changes. Overall, students in the study maintained their reading achievement levels over the summer period. Because students in the control group as well as the participant group maintained their reading achievement levels, it may be that the maintenance of reading achievement was due to factors other than participation in the summer reading program.

There are several issues which raise questions about these results. Inferences drawn from these test results can be challenged because of the small number of students in the control group, the differences in the sample sizes, the appropriateness of a standardized achievement test as a measure of impact resulting from recreational reading, and the short interval between the pretest and posttest. Comparison of participant and control groups' survey results (qualitative data) with the test results (quantitative data) did not show relationships that were sufficient to warrant a conclusion that maintenance of achievement levels was due to participation in the summer reading program. As an illustration, Table 9 provides a comparison of incentive points with change scores which fails to confirm a direct connection between program participation and change in test scores.

TABLE 9

Incentive Points and Change Score Comparison
(Median Incentive Points = 397.5)

	Mean Change in Vocabulary	Mean Change in Comprehension	Mean Change in Total Reading
Participants with more than 397.5 points	2.4	- 3.2	- 0.6
Participants with less than 397.5 points	4.0	- 1.4	0.9

The analysis of quantitative data such as the standardized reading achievement scores used in this study are not sensitive enough measures to evaluate the effects of a reading program such as the Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library's summer reading program for children. Although the maintenance and improvement of reading performance is an appropriate goal of the program, evaluation techniques that more credibly identify attributes correlated with reading achievement are necessary for an informative study of this summer reading program.

Descriptive Study

The descriptive portion of this study centered on survey and interview data. Surveys were collected from participants who were in the pretest-posttest part of the study and from parents whose children were participating in the summer reading program. Librarians at six neighborhood libraries were interviewed. The inclusion of the participant survey provided a way of finding out about the opinions and experiences of children in the program. The parent survey gave another perspective of the program and covered several of the same topics as the participant survey. Librarians, as the professional staff responsible for implementing the summer reading program, provide an additional view of the program. This portion of the study also includes an analysis of participation data collected at the nine study sites during the first month of the summer reading program.

Participant Survey

Survey Development: The participant survey was developed using standard procedures recommended in educational literature (e.g., Borg and Gall, 1983; Converse and Presser, 1986; Fowler, 1984). Initial item development centered on topics from the review of the literature and the expressed goals of the summer reading program. These included incentives as motivation for reading, influence of family on summer reading, frequency and amount of reading, and pattern of participation at the library.

A two-stage pilot was used to test and refine the survey instrument. First, face-to-face surveys were conducted with approximately 25 children in early July; open-ended questions were used to elicit responses. The results of these interviews were used to select and refine questions and answer choices for the draft questionnaire. Second, the draft questionnaire was completed by approximately 35 children in late July. These were self-administrations to ensure that the survey was clear and could be understood by young children. The results from this second pilot testing were used to construct the final survey instrument which was administered in early August, 1990. A copy of this survey is included in Appendix A of this report.

Data Collection and Analysis: The participant survey was administered to 164 children during the posttesting session in early August, 1990. This number represents a large proportion of the children in the quantitative study, although it is a very small percentage of the total summer reading program participation in these libraries. The 16-item survey included two questions about whether the child attended an IPS summer school in 1990 and one question about preferred summer activities. The remaining 13 items dealt with reading and the summer reading program.

Interpretation of self-reported data must be made cautiously due to the possibility that respondents chose their answers based on what they perceived researchers wanted to hear. This caveat particularly applies when there is only one data collection contact, and the respondents are children. It is recommended that the reader hold this in mind when considering the following item-specific data.

Reading was highly rated as a favorite summer activity for these participants. Thirty percent said "reading books, magazines or newspapers" was their favorite way to spend free time (item #3), and 49 percent said they liked to read "a lot" (item #4). Less than two percent of these participants considered themselves to be "a poor or bad reader" (item #5). Approximately two-thirds of the children said they read a minimum of three to four times each week (item #9).

Almost half of these children said that they lived within a 15-minute walk of their neighborhood library (item #11), and almost 70 percent reported coming to the library at least once each week (item #8). The primary reason stated for coming to the library was to check out books (52 percent), although reading at the library and spending points for prizes were key reasons for about 40 percent of the children (item #10). Most often the children said they visited the library with family members (item #16).

Prior participation in the library's summer reading program seemed to influence children who signed up this year. Although a third of the children said they signed up because of the prizes, 36 percent said they were in the program this year "because it was fun last year" (item #12). Of the two-thirds who had been in the program previously, 38 percent reported participating for three or more years (item #13).

The children listed two responses most commonly when asked what they liked about the summer reading program: "keeping up their reading skills" and "getting points for prizes" accounted for two-thirds of the responses (item #6). Two choices stood out when children were asked their favorite prize among the incentives offered. Over half of the children said they liked either the ice cream cones or children's fast food meal best (item #7).

While more than a quarter of the children said they "hardly ever or never" read with another person, approximately half responded that they read with someone else at least once each week. Three-quarters of this shared reading usually occurred with either their mother or a sibling (item #15). Few children reported reading often with their father (less than five percent).

Based on the survey results, the participant population could generally be described as a group of children who consider themselves adequate or better readers with favorable attitudes *toward reading. About two-thirds of them were children who had* participated in the summer reading program previously and who visited the library at least one time each week. About the same percentage of children said they signed up for the 1990 summer reading program because of the prizes or because it was fun last year. About half of these participants reported reading with another person (usually their mother or a sibling) at least once a week.

Parent Survey

Parents play an important role in the literacy development of their children, as noted in the literature review of this report. Parents are also considered important stakeholders in the public library's summer reading program for children. For example, it is generally assumed that parents are concerned with their children's reading progress; this program emphasizes family literacy by the inclusion of parents and preschoolers among participants; and results from the 1989 and 1990 studies of this program indicated that a large percentage of participants engaged in interactive reading with family members as part of their summer reading.

Parents are inherently involved in the public library's summer reading program, either as direct participants or indirectly through their children's participation. As such, their input was considered important in this study. That input was gathered via a telephone survey of parents who had children participating in the summer reading program at one of the nine library sites included in this study.

Survey Development and Administration: The parent questionnaire was developed using procedures recommended by Lavrakas (1987). The initial survey items were developed in the same manner as the participants' survey; the staff of MECRE and the Public Opinion Laboratory at IUPUI were involved in writing and refining draft items. The draft questionnaire was piloted by the Public Opinion Laboratory staff prior to finalizing the survey instrument. A copy of the telephone survey questionnaire is included in Appendix A of this report.

The sample of parents for this survey were drawn from the same sources used to develop the participant pool for the quantitative portion of the study. Because this was a telephone survey, participants without a home telephone were excluded; all other participants were included in the parent survey pool. A total of 1200 participants' parents were in this survey pool.

The telephone survey was conducted by the staff of the Public Opinion Laboratory in late July, 1990. Selection of parents was random and depended upon (1) reaching a parent at home when the telephone call was placed, and (2) the parent's agreement to answer the survey questions. The study design called for a sample of 400 parents to be interviewed; a total of 411 parents completed the telephone survey questionnaire.

Survey Results:

The surveyed parents responded to a 26-item survey. Seventeen of the items were about reading or the summer reading program, while nine were demographic items to describe the population responding to the survey. The results of this parent survey are summarized in this section of the report.

Approximately two-thirds of these parents described their children as good or excellent readers, while fewer than five percent termed their child a "poor reader" (item #5). Similarly, over 80 percent said their children were "excited to" or "liked to" read, while five percent stated that their child "doesn't like" or "avoids" reading (item #6). When asked about the amount of library book reading their children do, almost two-thirds of the parents reported that their children do a "lot of library book reading" during the summer, an increase from the half who chose that response in relation to school year book reading (items #2 and #3).

The homes surveyed seem to be literate environments based on the materials parents said were available in the homes. More than three-quarters had the daily newspaper; more than 90 percent had their own books and magazines. However, the elementary-age children in these homes do not seem to use these materials routinely. Parents reported seeing about one-third of the children read the newspaper this summer, and only half reported that their children read their own books or magazines in the home (items #7 and 8).

Approximately three-quarters of the parents reported that their children see an adult reading in the home daily (item #9). About 45 percent of these parents stated that their children read with others; over two-thirds of these parents said the person their child reads with is his/her mother (item #4). Going to the library is typically a family affair in these homes. Over three-quarters said that their elementary-age child usually goes to the library with his/her parent(s) or sibling(s) (item #11).

The parents surveyed live relatively close to their neighborhood libraries; two-thirds said that they live within ten blocks of a library (item #10). They reported that their children's use of the library increases in the summer. While about 40 percent of the parents reported weekly (or more frequent) visits to the library during the school year, 60 percent make such regular visits during the summer. Sharper contrast is seen in the reports of daily visits to the library: only three percent reported such visits during the school year, while almost 14 percent said their children go to the library on a daily basis during the summer (items #12 and #13).

The parents were familiar with the library's summer reading program. About 55 percent said their children had participated in previous years (item #15). The parents were overwhelmingly in favor of an incentives-based reading program and gave various reasons for their support, such as "incentives encourage kids to read more," "kids like the competition", and "anything to motivate reading" (item #17). Parents were asked to give their opinion about the effectiveness of six categories of incentives (e.g., coupons for free food prizes, chances in a prize drawing) in motivating children's reading. All categories received favorable ratings from two-thirds to three-fourths of the parents, and few suggestions of additional incentives to try in the future were offered by the parents (item #16).

It is possible that this group of parents is not typical of the inner city population in Indianapolis. For example, two-thirds of the respondents were married (two-parent households), and a similar percentage stated that their educational level was high school graduate or higher (items #20 and #23). Representativeness notwithstanding, these parents' opinions of their children's reading could be generally described as favorable. Most parents see their children as good readers who enjoy reading. Many of these families visit the library regularly and have participated in previous summer reading programs at the library. There was almost unanimous parental support for the concept of an incentives-based reading program.

Comparison of the Participant and Parent Survey Results

In general, the elementary-age children and the parents responded similarly to the same topics on their respective surveys. Differences were usually in terms of degree rather than direction of responses. Examples of these differences are only 55 percent of the parents said their children had been in the program for two or more years, while almost 70 percent of the children indicated they had participated in previous summer reading programs at the library. Also, parents indicated that the majority of their children (55 percent) read alone, while 52 percent of the children said that they read with someone once a week or more often. When designating who the child usually read with, two-thirds of the parents responded "mother," while only 40 percent of the children chose this response. A third of the children said they usually read with a sibling.

However, some reactions to topics were almost identical. In terms of frequency of summer reading, 63.5 percent of the parents said their children read "a lot" while 63.2 percent of the children said they read at least three to four times each week. Almost 70 percent of both children and parents responded that they visited the library at least once a week during the summer reading program. There were no topics on which there was substantial difference between the opinions of the parents and the participating children.

Interviews with Librarians

Twelve informally structured interviews were conducted with librarians between June and September, 1990. These interviews addressed the librarians' perspectives on the summer reading program in general as well as specific factors which they felt enhanced and inhibited the summer reading program's success in their libraries. Librarians from six of the nine branch sites were involved in these interviews. Of the three libraries not included, two had new librarians assigned during the summer, and it was felt that they would have limited perspectives on the participants and program at their new sites. At the third branch the librarian had scheduling conflicts each time researchers called to arrange an interview.

The librarians identified a number of factors which they thought contributed to the success of the summer reading program. The most frequently mentioned elements included the incentive prizes, the library's summer movie series, and school visits during May, 1990 to promote the program. Another factor which they felt increased children's interest in the library were social interactions related to the program (e.g., participants telling friends and neighbors about the program, competition between "reading buddies").

Several librarians felt that the library's status as an entertainment alternative was a contributing influence to children's use of the library during the summer. They stated that most children were not allowed free range in their inner city neighborhoods for a variety of reasons (e.g., traffic, gang activity). However, many parents allowed their children to come to the library because they felt it provided a safe, air-conditioned environment. Other librarians extended the perspective of a library's environment to include the affective atmosphere created for children. They mentioned the importance of the personal attention and encouragement which the children received at certain libraries. These librarians stressed being able to call children by their first names, setting and encouraging high expectations for the children, and providing security for children's personal belongings while they were at the library.

The librarians noted that many of the children use the library only during the summer. Some librarians have been at their particular branch library for several years and know "their kids". These librarians categorized the children into three groups: a winter group who usually visited the library once a week with a parent; "regulars" -- children who lived close by and visit the library more than twice a week throughout the year; and the third and largest, a summer group who participated only in the summer reading program or attending the summer movies. During the summer all librarians noted that the busiest day at the library was movie day, indicating that many children combine participation in the summer reading program and attendance at the movie series.

Major constraints to children's use of the library during the summer were attributed to two major factors: transportation and transiency. While most librarians thought that the lack of transportation was the number one constraint, they also stressed the transiency of the population in the inner city neighborhoods. Librarians easily shared examples of this transiency, such as one family who moved three times within three months and children from divorced homes who were shifted between their mothers' or fathers' homes.

A related factor which constrained some children's levels of participation in the program was the lack of support for reading at home. Most librarians expressed strong opinions about the importance of reading in the home and parents reading aloud to preschool-age children. The need for parental support of reading was cited as a high priority if children are to be encouraged to read during the summer.

All of the librarians expressed support for the summer reading program's primary intent: that children have positive experiences with the public library and enjoy exposure to a print-loaded environment. However, some librarians stated concern about the amount of actual reading that children did as part of the summer reading program. One librarian expressed apprehension that a number of children were "prize-scheming" and that these children would not reap the benefits and enjoyment which reading during the summer could presumedly provide.

The librarians were unanimous that they were underfunded, understaffed, and overworked during the summer reading program. While the success of the program was a source of pride, it also created a lot of work for the library staff. Nonetheless, the librarians offered several ideas to further enhance the success of the current program. These ideas included more contact with schools in close vicinity to the libraries and increased coordination between school and library staffs. One librarian extended this idea of coordination through increased participation by businesses in partnerships with schools and libraries.

Other librarians expressed interest in further study related to children's summer reading. Specific interest focused on the dynamics of interpersonal interactions related to children's reading -- i.e., the quantity and quality of contact with children as an affect on actual reading. One suggestion was for an observational-based study which included extended time observing children in the library combined with testing, interviews, and surveys. Another librarian recommended a review and refinement of the public library's annual survey as a means of gaining additional insights about the summer reading program.

Other Descriptive Data

Participation data at the nine neighborhood libraries were tracked closely during the first month of the summer reading program in order to draw a picture of who was attracted to this program. Librarians indicated that most of the participants registered during the first few weeks, and the data collected seemed to bear this out. Registration information was gathered by mid-July on 5,420 participants or 84 percent of the total summer reading program enrollment at those libraries. To check data reliability as well as to provide additional reference points, these data were cross-referenced with several sources. These data sources were: the list of 801 children in the initial pool (based on the April random mailing to 4000 IPS students), the 293 participants in the quantitative and descriptive portions of the study, and enrollment data from the IPS schools in the areas around these nine libraries.

Of the 5,420 registrations reviewed for these nine libraries, 58 percent were children in grades kindergarten through grade six, 33 percent were parents and preschool children, and 9 percent were students in grades seven through 12. The percentage of parents and preschoolers varied somewhat by library, from a low of 20 percent to a high of 44 percent. The averages for secondary grade students were more constant, ranging from seven to 12 percent across the nine sites.

The distribution of students in grades kindergarten through grade six followed a consistent pattern. Grades one through five each accounted for about nine or ten percent of the total registration. Kindergarten accounted for slightly less (eight percent), and grade six showed a noticeable drop in enrollment to six percent of the total. This same pattern of relatively equal participation in grades one through five with an observed drop at grade six was also noted on the participant sample for the quantitative and descriptive portions of this study.

It is estimated that the summer reading program attracted approximately one-fifth to one-third of the elementary-age children who live near these inner city libraries. A number of confounding factors make it difficult to link program participation with certain school or residency areas. The transiency of the population, mandatory busing policies, and private school enrollments entangle a reliable estimate. Further complications are added by children's freedom to participate at any library site (i.e., register at a site other than the library nearest their home) and data inconsistencies across the preschool, secondary school, and adult participants in the neighborhood library sites.

The estimate of one-fifth to one-third of the elementary school-aged population is based on the percentage of the initial pool who registered at a neighborhood library (13 percent) and a interpolation of the total number registered for grades kindergarten through grade six compared to the pubic/nonpublic enrollment at the 21 closest elementary schools (37 percent) and the 39 elementary schools represented among the 293 students in the participant pool (19 percent).

The fact that there are large numbers of low-achieving readers in this large urban school district is easily established. For example, during the 1989-90 school year, 27 percent of the elementary-grade students received Chapter 1 remedial instruction. To estimate the percentage of low-achieving readers attracted to the program, a list of 155 IPS Chapter 1 reading students in the initial pool of 801 children was checked during the first month of the program. Of the 105 children from the initial pool who registered for the program, 15 were also on the Chapter 1 student list. This could be interpreted to indicate that approximately 14 percent of the summer reading program participants were low achievers. This figure is slightly higher than the 12 percent of students from the quantitative study whose posttest scores were in the lowest quartile and greatly exceeds the "poor reader" figures given in the parent survey (five percent) and the participant survey (two percent). As such, it could be considered the outside margin estimating the percentage of low-achieving readers participating in the summer reading program at these nine libraries.

Summary of the Descriptive Study

An analysis of the various data subsets identified the following summary statements for the descriptive portion of this study. The specific sources for each assertion are listed in parentheses following each statement.

1. **The public library's summer reading program attracts primarily average and above-average achieving readers who have positive attitudes toward reading.** (Participant survey, parent survey, registration-based data)

2. **The incentives appear effective in encouraging participation in the summer reading program. The incentives-based program seems well-liked by the children and well-supported by parents and librarians.** (Participant survey, parent survey, librarian interviews)

3. **Children's participation at the library clearly increases during the summer. "Participation" is defined as engagement**

with the library or its programs; however, it is not possible to infer that reading occurs as a result of participation. (Participant survey, parent survey, librarian interviews)

4. **Once initially enrolled in the summer reading program, a participant is likely to continue in other elementary-school years. The majority of participants enrolled in the summer reading program have participated for more than one year.** (Participant survey, parent survey)

5. **Library visits frequently involve a participant's family, and many children engage in interactive reading with family members.** (Participant survey, parent survey)

6. **The public library serves as more than a repository of books for summer reading program participants. Attending movies, visiting with friends, and being in a safe, air-conditioned environment were all cited as reasons for library visits.** (Participant survey, parent survey, librarian interviews)

7. **It is difficult to accurately estimate the percentage of the overall elementary-aged population who participated in the summer reading program at the nine library sites. Problems in linking participation and school attendance data as well as variances in certain data among the nine sites complicate such a calculation.** (registration-based data)

Case Studies of Low-Achieving Readers

The commonly held assumption that one becomes a better reader by reading has more than intuitive appeal. Research evidence supports that good readers read more, and, conversely, poor readers do less recreational reading than better readers (Stahlschmidt, 1981; Talan, 1980; Kemmerer, 1980; Greany, 1980). However, evidence from the 1989 study of this summer reading program indicated that some of the participants were low-achieving students. Such low-achieving students who voluntarily read during the summer were a departure from the prevailing pattern and invited study to gain insights about the factors and circumstances which influenced these children's out-of-school reading.

This portion of the study focused on a naturally occurring multifaceted event: low-achievers' participation in the public library's summer reading program. The appropriate methodology for this inquiry was case study using limited ethnographic techniques involving both quantitative and qualitative data. The general topics included in the case studies were those previously outlined: family as an influence and support for reading, the amount and type of reading done, involvement with the public library, and the affect of incentives on reading.

Selection of the Case Study Children: From the April, 1990 mailing to 4,000 IPS students, a pool of 801 children returned signed parental informed consent forms. This was the initial pool of participants for the study. From within this pool, a list of 155 children were identified by the school district as low-achieving readers -- children who received Chapter 1 remedial reading services during the 1989-90 school year. In IPS a child is selected for Chapter 1 services by a combination of low reading achievement test scores and referral by both his/her current and previous year's teachers.

This list of 155 Chapter 1 students was used to review summer reading program registrations at the nine neighborhood libraries during early June, 1990. A total of 12 children on that list enrolled in the summer reading program during that two week period. To ensure maximum variation among the case studies, information about these 12 students was reviewed on a matrix outlining school attended, grade in school, gender and race. To facilitate regular contact, only students with a home telephone were considered. Nine contacts were made about the case studies, and eight of those parents and children gave informed consent for participation in the study.

Initial data collection included all eight children. One child was dropped from the study in late July when her family moved abruptly, and contact was interrupted for a period of time. Data collection was completed on the remaining seven cases.

Data Collection: As generally defined, a case study includes multiple methods of data collection which can generate both objective and subjective information (Yin, 1989; Merriam, 1988; Lincoln and Guba, 1984; Goetz and LeCompte, 1984). The sources of relevant information used in this study included:

- weekly interviews with each child throughout the summer reading program;
- limited observations of each child in his/her home and local public library;
- interviews with one or both parents of each child;
- interviews with four of the five librarians at the branch sites serving the case study participants;
- an ongoing weekly reading log maintained by each child during the summer reading program;
- tracking of each child's incentive points earned and spent during the summer reading program;
- a review of reading achievement pretest-posttest scores for each child;
- interviews with each child's teacher during the 1989-90 school year;
- two reading attitude inventories for each child; and
- an extended reading interview with each child.

In addition to collecting data related to the low-achieving readers' summer reading, the researcher maintained a reflexive journal throughout the study (Lincoln and Guba, 1984). This journal served as a daily log of research activities, as a methodological log, and for the personal reflections and insights of the researcher as data were collected.

Data Analysis: Data analysis followed the recommendations for limited ethnographic studies as outlined by Lincoln and Guba (1984), Goetz and LeCompte (1984), Merriam (1988), and Yin (1989). Data were recursively reviewed for significant events and patterns as they were collected; a comprehensive member check was conducted with each child in mid-August, 1990.

At the end of data collection, the results from the various sources were entered into AskSam, a free-form text database computer program. This database was queried in several ways and provided an additional way of identifying significant events and patterns in each child's data. These results were used in writing a preliminary case study story for each child which served as the basis for another member check in mid-October, 1990. These preliminary stories were further refined, resulting in the stories and interpretations found in this report.

Reliability and validity in a qualitative study are considered in terms of credibility, transferability, and dependability of the data presented (Lincoln and Guba, 1984). These were established for this study in the following ways:

1. the development of a case study protocol as an audit tool. This protocol outlines the field procedures, the key questions guiding the case studies, and a detail profile of each case study report;
2. the use of multiple sources of evidence and an established chain of evidence and pattern-matching as part of data analysis (e.g., use of the AskSam database);
3. use of a peer debriefer and an external auditor throughout the project.

Individual Case Study Stories: A commonly accepted truism in education accentuates the uniqueness of each child. The seven low-achieving readers who participated in the case studies exemplified this belief as summer reading varied noticeably from child to child. The stories in Appendix B relate the summer reading program experiences of these seven readers. For confidentiality purposes, pseudonyms are used and identifying information (e.g., school and library names) have been omitted. Each story was verified by the respective case study child as a valid representation of his/her summer experiences with one exception. One child moved at the end of summer, and his story was validated using qualitative data audit procedures.

Cross-Case Analysis of the Case Studies: A single case study can provide information about the unique experiences of an individual child. However, cross-case analysis of multiple case studies can potentially provide a general explanation or framework for considering those unique experiences. The case studies of each of the seven low-achieving readers were considered in a cross-case analysis to determine if such an explanation was appropriate for this study. These analyses were structured around the topics previously outlined in this study: involvement with the public library, the affect of incentives on reading, the amount and type of reading done, and family as an influence and support for reading.

Involvement with the public library: A review of the case study children's involvement with the library centered on patterns of library use during the summer and school year, frequency of library use, relationship with library personnel, and distance between each child's home and branch library. Three patterns were noted across the seven case studies.

1. **During the summer reading program, all seven children were active library users.**

   Two children visited the library an average of every seven to ten days, while two children made a weekly trip to the library. Three children visited the library two or more times each week during the summer reading program.

2. **The three children who lived closest to a branch library were more active library users during the year than the four children who lived more than ten blocks from a library. However, active library use was not necessarily related to the amount of summer reading done by the children.**

   The four children who lived closest to a library visited the library throughout the year; however, two of these children read fewer than five books during the summer reading program. Of the three children who lived a mile from the library, only one used the library during the school year. But two of these children were active summer readers, completing more than 18 books during the two month program.

3. **The low-achieving readers in this study had several reasons for their library visits other than checking out books.**

   Four of the case study children attended the summer movies; two of these children had perfect or near perfect attendance at the library's movie series. Two of the children brought younger siblings to the library to choose books, and four children made at least one socially-oriented visit to the library with friends during the summer. Four children went to the library "to have something to do" or "to get out of the house."

Summer reading program: The children's involvement with the summer reading program was reviewed several ways: years in the program; access to information about the program; the affect of incentives; and how children earned and spent points. Three cross-subject statements were drawn from these data.

4. **The children were unanimous: they liked earning points for prizes.**

   As Timmy stated, he liked that "you can earn prizes rather than just read." This statement seemed to reflect the feelings of the other children as well. Sann even commented, "I wouldn't be reading this summer if it weren't for the library's summer reading program."

5. **While most children spent their points on a variety of prizes, the food prizes (especially the ice cream cones) were most popular.**

   While only one child spent all of his points for food, all of the children spent some points for food coupons. Most children sampled a variety of prizes from the incentives menu, but the ice cream cones and french fries were likely to be chosen more than once.

6. **For most children a tight connection could not be established between the number of points received and the number of books read.**

   The number of points received by the children ranged from 190 to the maximum 500 points, but the number of points received was not directly tied to the amount of reading done. One boy who had the maximum 500 points completed only four books, while the other three children with this point total read 19, 30 and 45 books. One girl who received 225 points completed two books, while another girl who received 335 points read 18 books. While the difficulty level of books read may account for some of these points/books differences, the discrepancies also seem related to "game playing" and inaccuracies in the reading logs maintained by the children.

Amount and type of reading: Despite efforts to ensure accurate record-keeping by the children, the researcher was aware that the children's logs were not always precisely maintained. For this reason, the amount of reading should be considered a close estimate rather than an exact count for a child. Within this parameter, the number of books attempted and completed, the difficulty of the books selected contrasted to a child's approximate reading level, the type of books chosen, each child's expressed attitude toward reading, and their pretest-posttest scores were reviewed.

7. **For six of the seven children, reading attitude was expressed by one of two phrases: "it's not my thing," or "it's fun sometimes." Children with less positive attitudes read less than those expressing more positive attitudes.**

   The two children who expressed negative attitudes toward reading completed two and four books, while the four children voicing more positive attitudes read between 18 and 45 books during the summer program. One child verbally expressed that he loved reading and thought reading was fun; however, he completed few books during the summer.

8. **The more active readers seemed to exhibit both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation toward summer reading, while less active readers seemed limited to extrinsic motivators.**

   All of the children indicated in numerous ways that they liked the incentives of the summer reading program. But when the four more active readers (who completed 18 to 45 books) were compared to the less active readers (who completed less than five books), differences in the children's interest and commitment to summer reading were noted.

   These differences varied among the children. One child was a confident reader whose success in reading reinforced the pleasure she found in books. One boy and his mother shared books through a comfortable, supportive relationship which seemed to emphasize enjoyment. One boy was an earnest young man who took his involvement in the summer reading program seriously, first completing 500 points of his own reading and then reading (and earning points) with his younger brother. Being part of this study made a big impression on one girl; she read the series books she liked and enjoyed the attention shown in her reading.

On the other hand, the three inactive readers never got personally involved in reading or the library's program this summer. For two of the children, their attitudes seemed to be a factor: reading just wasn't their thing. The third child seemed to be a passive participant in summer reading activities orchestrated by his mother. These children could verbalize what they heard from their parents and teachers: it is important to be a good reader. But their actions did not show that they internalized this message. Little seemed to capture their interest or enjoyment of reading this summer.

9. **No strong pattern of reading achievement change was apparent for the more active and less active readers.**

   Of the four active readers, one achieved a noticeable gain, one essentially maintained her pretest level, one measured a large loss, and one obtained a mixed gain and loss among the reading subtests. While less active readers generally showed small declines in reading achievement, no strong pattern was evident.

Home influences and support: The data for each of the seven case studies were reviewed relative to the home literacy environment, interactive reading between parent(s) and child, value statements about reading made by parents, and parental involvement in the summer reading program. While home influence and support were noted in a variety of ways for several children, no discernible patterns were noted across the set of children. In particular, no consistent correspondence could be made between a child's home literacy environment and the amount of reading completed by that child. Similarly, no clear relationship could be established between the expressed parental support of their children's involvement in the summer reading program and the amount of reading completed by those children.

Summary of Case Studies

The cross-case analyses provided a broad summary for the case studies of seven low-achieving readers. A reiteration of the major points from these analyses is presented in this synopsis.

1. **Proximity to a public library is associated with library use throughout the school year, and summer reading program**

participation is related with active library use during the summer for low-achievers. However, neither factor is correlated with the amount of summer reading done by the case studies children.

2. These low-achievers liked the incentives-based program (especially the food prizes), but no tight link was established between the number of points received and the number of books read. Similarly, changes in reading achievement could not be directly correlated with amount of summer reading.

3. Low-achievers who expressed a positive attitudes toward reading generally read more than those with less positive attitudes.

4. Low-achievers who were active readers seemed to exhibit intrinsic motivation in addition to the extrinsic motivation which served as the framework of the summer reading program.

5. The low-achieving readers in this study had several reasons for their library visits other than checking out books.

Study Findings

The discussion of the findings from this study is centered on the six key questions which framed this 1990 study of the Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library's summer reading program for children.

1. **Do participants in the Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library's summer reading program for children maintain the reading achievement levels exhibited at the time of the statewide achievement testing?**

2. **How does the reading achievement of the participants in the summer reading program compare to the reading achievement levels of similar students who do not participate in the summer reading program?**

Based on the results from the quantitative portion of the study, the answer to the first question is yes, summer reading program participants maintain their spring, 1990 reading achievement levels. However, a comparison of participants' pretest-posttest results to a control group's results showed that the control group also maintained their pretest reading levels.

There are multiple problems in clearly interpreting these data and linking any impact between the test results and the summer reading program. A review of the literature did not confirm the assumption of summer regression. Even if summer regression does exist, previous studies have shown that gains measured for pretest-posttest periods of less than one year to be unstable (National Assessment of Chapter 1, 1987). The testing interval between pretest and posttest in this study was five months. It is doubtful that a standardized achievement test is sensitive enough to accurately detect discrete gains over that short time interval.

An additional issue is the nature of the groups who volunteered to take the test. On the whole, the children in the participant and control groups were above-average in reading achievement. The debateable normalcy of these distributions inhibits confident interpretation of the results. The size of the tested groups presents yet another obstacle. Standardized achievement tests are best used to measure large numbers of students where individual data fluctuations tend to be moderated by group size. While the participant group size was relatively small, the size of the control group (N=16) was very small and makes their data difficult, if not impossible to interpret when error of measurement is considered.

These multiple confounding factors lead to the conclusion that achievement test data are not the best indicator of the summer reading program's impact. The answers to these questions are not suitably informative in an evaluation of this program.

3. **Who is attracted to an incentives-based summer reading program?**

On the whole, the 1990 summer reading program at the nine neighborhood libraries attracted children who have average to above-average reading achievement and positive attitudes toward reading and themselves as readers. The program proved equally attractive to students in grades one through five, and somewhat less attractive to students in grade six and higher. One interpretation for this upper-grade participation decline is that after grade six many children are in transition to new schools (e.g., junior high) and become more concerned with adolescence-related interests.

4. **What level of parental involvement is noted in the summer reading program, and what are the apparent benefits of this parental participation?**

A substantial level of parental involvement was described by both the children and parents of participants. Evidence of such involvement and related benefits for both parents and children were noted in two primary activities:

1. approximately half of the participants and parents read interactively as part of this program; and

2. the majority of participants and parents reported regular visits to the public library with their family during the summer reading program.

In a previous study parents have cited program benefits such as motivation for reluctant readers, children's increased love and appreciation of reading and knowledge, discouragement of television viewing, and fostering better use of time (Cairo, 1990). It can also be assumed that some, if not most parents and children also found pleasure in the shared activities of reading together and visiting the library. These provided low-cost entertainment alternatives with high potential for positive affect and increased self-esteem for both parent and child.

5. **What attracts and holds the low-achieving reader in the summer reading program?**

Evidence is lacking that a large proportion of low-achieving readers were attracted to the 1990 summer reading program. Of those studied, it appeared that incentives were a factor in attracting them to the program. Evidence suggests that intrinsic motivation influenced the amount of reading completed by low-achieving students. Examples of this motivation were a comfortable, supportive relationship with an adult who showed an interest in the child's summer reading and the self-motivation of one's success as a reader.

Another factor in low-achieving readers' participation in the program was their perception of the library as more than a repository of books. The majority of the case study children seemed to view the public library as an entertainment alternative and visited the library for reasons other than to check out books (e.g., attend movies, get out of the house).

6. **What are the effects of reading incentives on the amount and type of reading done by low-achieving readers?**

A tight connection can not be drawn between the points received for the incentive prizes and the amount of reading completed by low-achieving students. It appears that incentives are most effective in attracting the low-achieving readers to the library's program, but they do not directly relate to the amount of reading done.

In general, the type of reading done by low-achievers did not appear to be particularly influenced by the incentives. The case study children read a variety of books which ranged in incentive point value from five to 15 points. The low-achievers were not attracted to the "Bonus List of Accelerated Reading" despite the 25-point value of those books. This may suggest that the attraction of the extra points for this list was offset by a perception that these were difficult books.

The low-achievers' reading choices were similar to those any elementary-aged child might select for recreational reading. Series books were popular, notably choose-your-own-adventure stories for boys and mysteries or stories about young adolescents' problems for girls. Fiction books were chosen much more often than non-fiction, but a variety of genre (including poetry and folk/fairytales) were among the low-achieving children's selections.

Almost all of the books selected for recreational reading were below the children's estimated instructional reading level. This is typically expected for all children's pleasure reading choices. Most of the case study children expressed clear criteria for the books they liked regardless of the number of incentive points earned for a book. They wanted thin rather than thick books, books with interesting or attractive pictures on the covers, and some illustrations interspersed with the text. Another requirement was that the book not be "boring", especially in the beginning.

Limitations of the Study

The goal of any study is to produce meaningful results which are informative. However, the usefulness of a study's findings must be interpreted within the limitations of that study. The following points encourage caution in the interpretation of this study.

- Despite extensive efforts to attract a large sample for this study, it proved difficult to attract children to take a reading test in the summer. The sample in this study represents less than one percent of the overall participation in the summer reading program at the nine libraries.
- Certain data were unavailable on all participants in the study. Data such as the number and type of books checked out were collected only for the seven case study children. This limited conclusions which could be drawn on the amount and type of reading done by summer reading program participants in general.
- While the summer reading experiences of seven low-achievers were studied, there was no corresponding sample of high achievers. Thus, the reader is unable to compare or contrast two sets of readers in order to judge the apparent or inferred significance of the data provided on low-achievers.
- While case studies provide an in-depth picture which could not be drawn from the other study data, case study results are specific to the children studied. Case study conclusions and inferences cannot necessarily be generalized.
- The limited number of children at certain grade levels and in the control group restrict generalizations which can be made from these data.
- The summer reading program appears to attract average and above-average achievers; there was not a large population of low-achievers to include in this study. This limited the affects and effects which could be studied for low-achieving readers.

Conclusions

1. It appears that reading achievement test scores are maintained for both the participant and control groups, making it illogical to link reading achievement with the summer reading program. Besides, standardized test scores are felt to be an inappropriate measure of this program due to specialized concerns about change scores over the short pretest-posttest period and other technical issues.

   Future studies of this program should continue to apply qualitative approaches to assess this program's impact. Potential topics for such studies are the influence of readers' self-concept, exposure to reading materials, variations in parental involvement, and patterns of library use as related to summer reading.

2. It was not possible to relate the number of points received with reading achievement gains or the amount of reading completed during the summer. While a tight connection could not be drawn between the incentive points awarded and the participants' summer reading, it is important to value the role the incentives and points play in attracting children to the public library during the summer.

3. The 1990 summer reading program attracted primarily average and above-average readers. In order to attract and address low-achieving readers, more focused efforts are needed. One possibility would be a coordinated effort with the public schools and direct recruitment of these populations (e.g., in at-risk or Chapter 1 programs). Such efforts might produce other enhancements for the program, such as "reading for fun" support groups for low-achieving readers.

4. The Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library's summer reading program for children is clearly successful in terms of two significant and worthwhile outcomes: many children are attracted to regular library use during the summer, and these children enjoy positive experiences with the public libraries.

   These successes provide a foundation to build on for enhancing the potential impacts of this program. This reinforces the need for continuing inquiry of this summer reading program. Ongoing refinement of the library's internal evaluation process is encouraged. The results of such evaluative efforts may provide input for program adjustments leading to an even more successful program in the future.

5. The incentives appear effective in encouraging participation in the summer reading program. The incentives-based program

seems well-liked by the children and well-supported by parents and librarians.

6. A number of confounding factors were encountered as researchers tried to assess the levels of participation across children and parents. These included transiency, school attendance and mandatory busing, and variations in available data about parents and library visits. These confounding factors should be considered in future efforts to obtain an accurate picture of who is participating in the summer reading program. Consistency of the data collected as well as the collection procedures will contribute to a meaningful picture of the program.

7. Participation in the summer reading program provides an opportunity for family involvement in reading. As reported in this study, library visits for summer reading program participants frequently involved a participant's family, and many children engaged in interactive reading with family members during the summer reading program.

8. The variety of programs and activities at the public library stimulated children's interactions with the library. The public library serves as more than a repository of books for the summer reading program participants. Attending movies and special demonstration programs, visiting with friends, and being in a safe, air-conditioned environment were all cited as reasons for library visits.

APPENDIX A

1. Participant Survey Form and Results
2. Control Group Survey Form and Results
3. Parent Telephone Survey Form and Results

Participant Group survey

THE 1990 STUDY OF THE SUMMER READING PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

1. Did you go to summer school **for reading?** **YES** 26.7% **NO** 73.3%

2. Did you take the ISTEP test **in July this summer?** **YES** 7.3% **NO** 92.7%

Check ( ) **one** answer for each question below.

3. **My favorite way to spend free time is:** (Responses reported in percentages)

9.6 playing outside
28.1 playing with friends
25.1 going swimming
7.2 watching television
29.9 reading books, magazines or newspapers

4. I like to read:

48.5 a lot
43.7 sometimes
7.8 hardly ever

5. I think I am:

61.3 a good reader
36.9 an okay reader
1.8 a poor (or bad) reader

6. The best part of the Summer Reading Program is:

33.1 getting points for prizes
35.2 keeping up my reading skills
24.6 reading books
5.6 seeing movies

7. My favorite prize in the Summer Reading Program is:

3.5 bookmarks
14.9 paperbacks
27.7 ice cream
5.7 pencils
2.8 chicken stix
0.7 hot dog
9.2 shoe laces
3.5 sun glasses
7.8 crispy curls
24.1 Hardee's children's meal

8. I visit the library:

6.5 every day
28.6 2-3 times a week
33.3 once a week
16.7 once every two weeks
10.1 once a month

9. During the summer, I usually read:

33.7 every day
29.5 3-4 times a week
22.9 1-2 times a week
7.8 about once every two weeks
6.0 almost never

10. The main reason I come to the library is:

20.5 to spend points and get prizes
51.8 to check out books
19.3 to read at the library
0.6 to be alone
4.2 to get out of the house
3.6 to see a movie

11 To walk from my house to the library takes about:

22.8 5 minutes
11.4 10 minutes
11.4 15 minutes
12.0 20 or more minutes
41.9 I always ride in a car or a bus to the library

12. The main reason I signed up for the Summer Reading Program is:

32.4 the prizes
36.0 because it was fun last year
12.9 because someone in my family signed me up
2.9 because my friends signed up
15.8 I heard about it at school

13. I have been in the library's Summer Reading Program:

30.9 1 year (this year)
30.9 2 years
38.1 3 years or more

14. I read with another person:

13.4 every day
23.8 2-4 times a week
13.4 once a week
20.7 a few times this summer
28.7 hardly ever or never

15. When I read with someone, I most often read with:

32.5 Mother
4.2 Father
13.3 Friends
25.9 Brother or Sister
6.0 Other person -- write your answer ____________________
18.1 I don't read with another person

16. When I visit the library, I most often come:

10.9 by myself
55.8 with my mother
4.2 with my father
14.5 with my friends
14.5 with my brother or sister

Control Group Survey

THE 1990 STUDY OF THE SUMMER READING PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

1. Did you go to summer school **for reading?** YES 31.3% NO 68.8%

2. Did you take the ISTEP test **in July this summer?** YES 12.5% NO 87.5%

3. Did you sign up for the public library's summer reading program? YES NO 100%
If **YES**, at which library? ______________________

Check ( ) one answer for each question below.

4. My favorite way to spend free time is:
31.3 playing outside
12.5 playing with friends
31.3 going swimming
--- watching television
25.0 reading books, magazines or newspapers

5. I like to read:
43.8 a lot
43.8 sometimes
12.5 hardly ever

6. I think I am:
50.0 a good reader
50.0 an okay reader
---- a poor (or bad) reader

7. I visit the library:
---- every day
6.3 2-3 times a week
12.5 once a week
6.3 once every two weeks
18.8 once a month
56.3 hardly ever

8. During the summer, I usually read:
6.3 every day
25.0 3-4 times a week
37.5 1-2 times a week
12.5 about once every two weeks
18.8 almost never

9. The main reason I come to the library is:
12.5 to spend points and get prizes
37.5 to check out books
25.0 to read at the library
--- to be alone
--- to get out of the house
--- to see a movie
25.0 I don't go to the library

10. To walk from my house to the library takes about:

12.5 5 minutes
6.3 10 minutes
18.8 15 minutes
---- 20 or more minutes
56.3 I always ride in a car or a bus to the library
6.3 I don't go to the library

11. I read with another person:

---- every day
6.7 2-4 times a week
6.7 once a week
20.0 a few times this summer
66.7 hardly ever

12. When I read with someone, I most often read with:

31.3 Mother
--- Father
--- Friends
25.0 Brother or Sister
6.3 Other person -- write your answer ____________________
37.5 I don't read with another person

13. When I visit the library, I most often come:

6.3 by myself
50.0 with my mother
6.3 with my father
6.3 with my aunt or uncle
--- with my grandmother or grandfather
12.5 with my friends
18.8 with my brother or sister

COVER SHEET

CASE NUMBER ____ ____ ____ ____

NAME ______________________________

TELEPHONE NUMBER ______________________________

Hello, my name is (INSERT YOUR NAME) of Indiana University's Public Opinion Laboratory. May I speak with (INSERT R.S NAME)? He/she/you (are) is being contacted as part of a project to study children's reading and use of libraries during the summer. We are trying to find out some of the things that encourage or discourage children in using libraries and reading during the summer. All your answers are anonymous and confidential. The interview only takes about 5 minutes. (GO RIGHT TO QUESTION #1).

RESULTS OF INTERVIEW

DATE	INTERVIEWER	TIME	RESULT

COMP = Complete NA = No Answer B = Busy CB = Call Back
NIS/WN = Not in service/wrong number NIQ = Not in age/sex quota
NR = Not Residence DL = Deaf/No English REF = Refusal

First, let me make sure I have the right person. Do you have a child in grades 1 through 6 that may be participating in the Public Library's summer reading program? (IF NO THANK AND TERMINATE).

1. How many children in grades 1 through 6 are there living in your household? 1= 34.5% 3 = 19.2% 5 or more = 2%
2= 39.9% 4 = 4.4%

____

2. Thinking of your child(ren) in grades 1 to 6, how much reading of library books does he/she do in the summer (when school is not meeting)? Would you say he/she does a lot of library reading, some library reading, very little library reading or no library reading?

A lot	[63.5%]
Some	[28.5%]
Very Little	[6.8%]
None	[0.7%]
Don't know	[0.5%]
No answer	[-----]

3. What about during the school year? Would you say he/she does:

A lot	[47.9%]
Some	[35.0%]
Very Little	[13.4%]
None	[2.7%]
Don't know	[0.7%]
No answer	[0.2%]

4. Does your child(ren) usually read alone or with someone else?

Alone	[55.2%]
Someone else	[44.8%]

(IF SOMEONE ELSE, ASK)
Who is the person that usually reads with your child(ren)?

Mother	[30.9]
Father	[1.5]
Grandparent	[1.2]
Other Adult	[0.7]
Brother/Sister	[7.3]
Someone else (SPECIFY)	[3.6]
Reads alone	(54.7)

5. Thinking of your child(ren) in grade 1 to 6, would you say he/she is an excellent, good, average, or poor reader?

Excellent	[32.7]
Good	[33.4]
Average	[28.3]
Poor	[4.4]
Don't know	[1.2]
No answer	[---]

6. How do you think your child(ren) feels about reading? Would you say your child(ren) is excited to read, likes to read regularly, thinks reading is OK and reads once in a while, doesn't like to read, or avoids reading whenever possible?

Excited to read	[38.9]
Likes to read	[44.0]
Thinks reading is okay	[11.2]
Doesn't like to read	[3.6]
Avoids reading	[1.5]
Don't know	[0.5]
No answer	[0.2]

7. I am going to read a list of reading materials that some people have in their homes. Please tell me if you have any of the following in your home today: (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

	% Responding "YES"
Daily newspapers	[78.6%]
Magazines	[90.5%]
Books, other than library	[92.2%]
Pamphlets	[64.0%]
Encyclopedias	[65.7%]
Library books	[86.6%]
Anything else (SPECIFY) ______________________	[1.2%]

8. Besides public library books, does your child read any of the reading materials you have in your home during the summer?

Yes	[84.9]

(IF YES, ASK)

What does he/she read? (READ LIST/CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

Daily newspapers	[35.5]
Magazines	[54.1]
Books other than library books	[51.0]
Encyclopedias	[20.2]
Pamphlets	[20.7]
Anything else (SPECIFY)	[3.9]

____

No	[12.7]

9. How often does your child(ren) see adults in your home reading? Would you say other people in your home read: (READ LIST)

Daily	[77.4]
Every few days	[16.3]
Once a week	[3.4]
Once a month	[1.2]
Never	[1.2]
Don't know	[0.5]
No answer	[---]

10. How far (IN BLOCKS IF POSSIBLE) do you live from the nearest public library?
Less than 10 blocks = 67.2%
10-15 blocks = 25.3%
Greater than 15 blocks = 7.5%

11. When your child goes to the library does he/she go: (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

Alone	[12.7]
With a parent	[71.0]
With a brother/sister	[27.1]
With friends	[17.3]
Other (SPECIFY)________________	[4.4]

12. During a typical week during the school year (when school is meeting), how often does your child(ren) go to the public library? Does he/she go: (READ LIST)

Daily	[2.9]
1-2X a week	[42.4]
Twice a month	[24.6]
Once a month	[16.8]
< Once a month	[5.6]
Never	[5.1]
Don't Know	[1.7]
No answer	[0.7]

13. What about a typical week during the summer (when school is not meeting)? Does he/she go: (READ LIST)

Daily	[13.6]
1-2X a week	[56.7]
Twice a month	[21.4]
Once a month	[4.4]
< Once a month	[2.2]
Never	[0.5]
Don't Know	[0.2]
No answer	[0.5]

14. Could you describe the type of materials your child(ren) usually checks out from the public library? That is are they mostly picture books, books with some pictures with a little text, books with mostly text and only a few pictures or books of all text (words) as far as what is in them? (PROBE:VIDEOTAPES, BOOKS WITH CASSETTE TAPES, MAGAZINES????)

picture books = 13.9%   easy readers = 19% text with few pictures = 37%

all text = 18.7%   video, audio cassettes = less than 8%

15. Is this your child's first year participating in the library's summer reading program?

Yes	[43.8]
No	[54.5]
Don't know	[0.2]
INAP	[0.7]
NA	[0.7]

16. Now I am going to read you a list of incentives or prizes that some libraries give to children. Using a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being an excellent incentive and 5 being a poor incentive, please rate each of the following as to how well you feel they would motivate your child(ren) to read.

Coupons for free prizes at a fastfood restaurant such as Hardee's	77.8 1 2	11.0 3	11.2 4 5
Toys or things to play with (e.g. frisbee)	63.9 1 2	18.5 3	17.6 4 5
Free paperback books	68.8 1 2	15.1 3	16.1 4 5
Things to wear (e.g. colored shoelaces or a hat)	70.7 1 2	14.9 3	14.4 4 5
Pencils, colored markers or similar school supplies	72.0 1 2	13.9 3	14.1 4 5
Chances in a prize drawing for a bigger prize, such as concert tickets	65.4 1 2	12.0 3	19.8 4 5
Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	1 2	3	4 5

17. Are you interested in having your child participate in incentive based or prize/rewarded library summer reading programs in the future?

Yes [96.8]

No [0.5]

(IF YES OR NO ASK:) Why do you feel this way?

____

____

____

Undecided [0.7]

DK [0.2]

NA [1.0]

Now I have just a few more questions to make sure the people we talk to are representative of all people in Indianapolis.

1-2 = 17.8% 6-11 = 31%

18. How many people live in your household? 3 - 5 = 19.9% NR = 29%

19. What are their ages? (ENUMERATE)

____

____

20. What is your marital status?

Married	[65.6]
Divorced	[13.4]
Separated	[4.1]
Other (SPECIFY) __________________	[15.6]
NA	[1.2]

21. Do you live in a(n):

Apartment	[9.5]
House	[86.8]
Condominium	[0.2]
Mobile Home	[0.5]
Public Housing	[1.5]
Other (SPECIFY) __________________	[1.4]

22. Do you own or rent the place in which you live?

Own	[57.1]
Rent	[40.7]
INAP	[-----]
DK	[0.5]
NA	[1.7]

23. What is the highest level of education you completed?

Graduate work	[4.1]
Completed 4 year college	[7.8]
Some College	[30.5]
High School (12 yrs.) or GED	[39.0]
Some High School (9-11 yrs.)	[14.4]
Less than High School (0-8 yrs.)	[2.0]
DK	[---]
NA	[2.2]

24. What is your occupation? (GET COMPLETE DESCRIPTION OF JOB. INCLUDING TITLE, DUTIES, AND NUMBER SUPERVISED IF ANY. ANSWERS SUCH AS "MANAGER" OR "CONSULTANT" WILL NOT BE ACCEPTABLE! FIND OUT WHAT KIND OF MANAGER / CONSULTANT THEY ARE. *DETAILS*).

____

____

____

25. (IF APPLICABLE:) What is your spouse's occupation? (PROBE FOR *DETAILS*)

____

____

26. What is your race?

White	[48.4]
Black	[47.7]
Native American	[0.7]
Asian	[0.7]
Hispanic	[1.0]
Other(SPECIFY) ______________	[1.5]
NA	[ ]

That is all of the questions I have. Thank you for your time and cooperation. Remember YOUR OPINION COUNTS!

APPENDIX B

Individual Case Study Stories

1. Ameesha
2. Timmy
3. Walter
4. Jason
5. Octavius
6. Sann
7. Lorie

General Discussion: Cross-case Analysis

Ameesha

Ameesha shared her opinion in a straight forward manner: "I think everything about reading is easy." The confidence in this statement aptly characterizes this young reader. A pretty girl with dark curls and large, bright eyes, she has just finished second grade. A bundle of energy, Ameesha is sometimes described as "friendly and hyper" by her mother and "interested in everything" by her teacher. The youngest child in a family which includes a sister, three brothers, and her mother, she is a regular user of the public library four blocks from her house where she is on first name basis with the children's librarian.

This summer was a busy time for Ameesha. She liked playing outside -- her special accomplishment was learning to ride her new bicycle. But her play outdoors was sometimes curtailed by hot weather which aggravated her asthma. On those days she would often watch TV, play indoors, or walk over to the public library and read.

Reading at the library was the primary way she read this summer. Most of the members of her family aren't very interested in reading, and as Ameesha said, "I don't read at home very much." There are seldom newspapers or magazines to read at her house, and she has few books of her own. Besides, for the majority of the summer her library card was suspended due to a lost book fine. That meant that she could not check out books to take home and read. Although her library card was reinstated in late July, Ameesha's reading took place almost entirely at the local branch library.

Some weeks she came to the library almost every day, while other weeks she could come only once or twice due to the hot weather or things going on at home. Her visits usually lasted about an hour and would follow a predictable pattern. Ameesha would choose two books, read them, discuss the books with the librarian, and then collect her points in the library's summer reading program. Until the $2.60 book fine was paid, the only way Ameesha earned points in the summer reading program was by reading at the library.

This was Ameesha's first year to be in the program, and she participated because "there was nothing to do" and she liked the prizes. In fact, she stated that the best part of the summer reading program was getting points for prizes.

She read enough books to earn 335 points during the eight week program. Some of her points were spent as she earned them, mainly for a fast food children's meal and ice cream cones. At the end of the program she spent the remainder of her points for a variety of prizes, including sunglasses, pencils, fast food coupons, and bookmarks.

This vivacious child seemed to enjoy her reading. She confidently states that "I am a good reader" while also admitting that reading is only fun "sometimes. I don't like to read when I can watch cable (TV) or go (somewhere)." Her generally positive attitude toward reading is reflected in the amount and variety of reading she did this summer and by her assertion that she "always reads the whole book." Within the first month of the program she had visited the library more than eight times and read 17 books. By the end of the program she had read more than 30 books from various genre: folk and fairy tales, poetry, fiction, "Bible stories" and humor.

She "enjoys library reading" because she can read what she wants to as compared to reading at school where the books have "some dull, dull stories" and you "have to read the same stories over and over." But even at school Ameesha knows she is a good reader because she "never gets below an A in reading" and she "can read better than some of my friends." Her teacher confirms that Ameesha was one of the top readers in her class.

Ameesha continued to visit the library after the summer reading program was over and "rented some books" to read. All total, she checked out 12 books -- six paperback books from the Sweet Valley Twins and Sweet Valley Kids series and six hardback books included Ramona the Brave and The Paper Crane. However, she failed to return the books by the due date, and a $5.80 overdue fine accumulated. Now her library card is again suspended until this fine is paid.

Her library visits were less frequent once school started. Ameesha is a third grader now and busy with a new school year. Her reading is currently focused on school texts, and she reports that she "talk with my friends in class, but I get all my work done. I'm still getting A's."

NOTE: Ameesha had been identified as a low achieving reader at the end of first grade and was placed in Chapter 1 for second grade. Her reading ability increased greatly during the second grade, and she is no longer considered a low achieving reader.

Timmy

Nine year old Timmy lives with his mother, dad and older brother in a house which is next door to his married sister and infant nephew Justin. He has lived in the same house on the city's east side all of his life. It is conveniently located across the street from his school and about a 15 minute walk from a public library.

Timmy is a veteran in the public library's summer reading program. He has "done this program since it first came out" about five years ago. "I started it before I could read when my mom would read for me." This handsome and friendly third grader was an active program participant again this year. He liked that "you can earn prizes rather than just read" and proved it by earning the maximum 500 points which he then traded for a variety of prizes, e.g., paperback books, shoelaces, a fast food children's meal.

Timmy is on a first name basis with the librarian at his branch library. Although Timmy does not use the public library during the school year, he and his mom have been regular patrons for several summers, coming to the library each week to watch the movie and check out books. His mom plays an important role in his summer reading -- not only by regular library visits, but as they read together at home.

In the summer Timmy usually checked out three books each week, and his mom checked out about six books. When they get home they "split the books and read them together." Most of the time they took turns reading -- he would select a book for his mom to read to him, and then select a book which he would read to her. About half to two-thirds of the books Timmy read in the summer reading program were read in this manner.

He also chose books which he read alone. Often these books were choose-your-own-adventure books. These are books with a variety of plot choices woven into the story; the story ends differently depending upon the options chosen by the reader. As a result of making choices, not all pages in the books are read. Often only about one-third to one-half of the total pages are read when completing a single choose-your-own-adventure story.

But when Timmy read one of these books, he read more than the minimum fraction of the book because his mom required that he read three endings for each book before he could count it for points in the summer reading program. Almost half of the books Timmy read this summer were choose-your-own-adventure stories.

During the summer Timmy also read to his infant nephew. He liked this aspect of the summer reading program because "Justin gets the points plus I get the points, too." When Timmy read with another child he said "mostly I read to someone who can't hardly read" -- a role that perhaps was modeled by his mom and their shared reading together.

The variety in his recreational reading meant that Timmy usually read three to five times each week for a total of one or two hours. Some weeks he read every day, but most often he read during the week rather than on weekends. He was "busy most days and can't read every day." When his dad was on vacation the family schedule became especially busy, and he went an entire week without reading any books.

But reading is a common part of Timmy's life. His mom has read to him "all of his life," and they enjoy a comfortable relationship in which sharing books comes easily. Timmy said he has "lots of my own books -- about a hundred of them." These are books which his mom bought at garage sales, as spur-of-the-moment purchases in stores, and through book clubs at school. Timmy said he "hardly ever reads them now -- like once a year" -- but he read them when they were new. "I read every one in there or heard it be read." Now he buys new books infrequently "because we can get them for free at the library."

Timmy enjoys many different kinds of books but is partial to fiction with "interesting characters and exciting stories." When he's reading a book, the story must be interesting as he starts reading the book. He gave the example of the book Caravan which he did not finish because "the story was boring. All you did is just ride a horse on a dirt road the whole time." Another example was the book Frank and Stein and Me. "It was a stupid book. It didn't have any pictures. Mom said just close your eyes and imagine pictures, but I almost fell asleep." They quit reading the book after about five pages because "(I) just couldn't get into it."

Timmy also prefers thin books rather than thick ones "because it would be more easier for me." He "wouldn't be interested (in a thick one) because it would take too long for me." He likes to finish a book "in a day or two." He felt that thick books "discourage my reading."

Once the summer reading program ended Timmy didn't do much reading. He termed the last week of summer as "boring" and was anxious for the new school year to start. He was looking forward to knowing who his new teacher would be and to seeing his old friends again.

Walter

Walter is a polite and good-natured nine year old boy who has recently finished third grade. He lives on the city's west side with his mother, father, older sister and younger brother. Their home is conveniently located cross-cornered from his school and about five blocks from a public library branch.

As with most children, summer was a favorite season for Walter. His time was easily filled playing with his brother and neighborhood friends. Walter's preferred activities included riding his bike, running races, and creating games to play, such as "police" or "Metro bus". He also enjoyed helping around his home.

Mondays through Fridays were very busy days around Walter's house. His mother babysat children in their home, and during the summer as many as 17 children were under his mother's supervision. Coordinating summer fun for this large group required organization and structure, and the schedule for the "babysitting kids" also impacted Walter's daily routine.

All of the children at Walter's house were signed up for the summer reading program, and part of their weekly schedule included two trips to the public library. One trip was made on Wednesday afternoon to see a movie. A second weekly visit was made to check out and return books. These two activities were regular parts of Walter's summer. With such regular library use, it was no surprise that Walter and his family are on a first name basis at their library.

Walter has been a participant in the summer reading program "for a bunch of years." He thinks the program "is fun" and liked the points and prizes you can get. He knew that he would participate this summer because "my mom signs me and my brother and my sister and the (babysitting) kids up every summer." It has become an expected part of his summers.

His reading in the summer program occurred in several ways. Sometimes he read books alone, but much of his reading was done with others. Each day after lunch the babysitting kids had naptime which began with reading a story aloud. Walter sometimes listened to or read those stories or occasionally went into his room to read a book of his own. Sometimes in the evenings or on a weekend he read with his brother, but most often her read with his mother.

He said he "reads with my mom every day that I read a book." They usually read together two or three times a week, and each session lasted about ten or fifteen minutes. Often they would read alternate pages, but his mother stated that Walter didn't always like to read with her because she required reading accuracy. "He knows I will make him go back and figure out a word" he misses while reading. Walter said that if he doesn't know the words he asked his mom, and she would always say "sound it out."

His mother also influenced Walter's choices of books at the library. Although he mentioned an interest in reading fifth and sixth grade books, he would sometimes choose an "easy book." An easy book was defined as one with a picture but not too much text on every page. But he didn't often check these books out, because his mother would tell him "pick out a couple of books from your section" and send him back to find another book. "His section" were the shelves containing the third and fourth grade books.

His trips to the library were a year-round event. During the school year he usually visited the library once every two or three weeks. In the summer those visits increased to twice each week. Although he occasionally went to the library by himself or with a friend, he almost always went with his mother, brother and sister.

This level of activity in the summer reading program indicates a child who likes reading, but there were some mixed signals in that regard. Walter stated that reading is fun and the he "likes to read a lot." He defined "reading a lot' as reading one book each week, an amount which was verified by his reading logs. He estimated that during the summer he read about two or three times each week for ten or fifteen minutes each session. Overall, this amounted to approximately 30 to 60 minutes of reading each week.

As in previous years, Walter was an active participant and earned the maximum 500 points possible in the summer reading program. His mother gave him permission to cash in his points once he completely filled his "point card", and he selected a variety of prizes. These included two pairs of sunglasses, two pairs of shoelaces, a pencil, ice cream cones, chicken sticks, and a children's fast food meal. Even though the program had ended, Walater's summer reading did not. He continued his weekly trips to the library and shared-reading with his mother.

Jason

Jason is a friendly and likeable ten year old, one of four brothers who live with his mother and dad on the city's west side. In many ways Jason might be described as a typical all-American boy. "Sports is number one" for this recent fourth grade graduate -- he has played on a baseball team for several years and registered to play organized football for the first time this fall. As a loyal Cubbie fan, he followed the Chicago Cubs baseball games on TV, and on hot summer days could often be found at the public swimming pool near his home. Almost every day this summer he rode his bicycle and played with neighborhood friends and his younger brother. Nintendo was frequently the game of choice when he and his friends played together.

Jason's recreational reading this summer came through his participation in the library's summer reading program. This was his first year to sign up for the program, although he has been quite familiar with the public library for several years. He lives about five blocks from the library and attends the school across the street. During the school year he often stops in the library on his way home from school to browse -- "look around and see what books they have." Last year his fourth grade class came to the public library every other week for thirty minutes to check out books. It was in one of those class visits that Jason learned about the summer reading program.

Although his friends don't particularly like to read and several were not in the summer reading program, his dad wanted Jason to sign up. Jason said that he signed up for the summer reading program because he liked the prizes and "to try to improve my reading -- I haven't' been doing too well. I was getting C's and D's in reading, and I'm trying to improve." He said that children should understand that "the reason they have the summer reading program is to help get education. Reading is the most important thing, and if you don't get it, you don't get a good education. (Kids should) read a couple of books a week, so they can improve their reading every week...so their reading keeps jumping higher and higher." Jason's statement seems to reflect his father's often stated philosophy about reading.

Jason thought the best part of the summer reading program was getting points for prizes. He received a total of 190 points during the program and spent them for food coupons. Ice cream cones, hot dogs and a children's fast food meal were his favorite items.

His participation in the program followed a predictable pattern. He visited the library once each week and checked out two books. These books were sometimes joke or cartoon books, but were usually books categorized as jZ or jE (easy reading) fiction. Altogether Jason check out 12 books. However, checking out books was not synonymous with reading the books. Jason said that he read all of four books and only parts of the other eight. When discussing the books together, it was often not clear how much he understood or enjoyed of those books.

Jason made it clear that "reading is all right, but it's not my favorite thing to do." This disinterest encompassed both school and recreational reading. He estimated that in the summer he read once or twice a week for a total of 30 minutes to one hour. Occasionally he and his dad read part of a book or magazine together, but Jason usually read alone at home. His dad observed that Jason reads "bits and pieces from the Sunday comics" and goes through books and magazines page-by-page, stopping to read when he comes to something that catches his eye. But, in general, Dad stated that Jason is a "reluctant" and "light" reader.

Jason stated reasons why reading is important in the future ("so you can get a good job") as well as in school now: "it's real important to call the words right, so you're not in trouble." But he doesn't seem to be very interested in recreational reading. His statement "reading is just not very much fun to do" seems to sum up his feeling and his reading activity this summer.

Octavius

Octavius is a tall, quiet 12 year old boy whose size suggests athletic ability. In fact, sports is on of his favorite interests. He likes all kinds of ball games -- basketball, football, or baseball -- and not just as a spectator. This summer his fifth grade summer school basketball team won the championship game.

But while Octavius is a boy who enjoys his play, he is also serious and mature for his age. The oldest of four sons, he helps his mother care for his younger brothers. His mother commented on how much help he is around the house, and he regularly mentioned helping his mom and caring for his brothers as activities filling his summer days.

He lives with his mom, her boyfriend, and his three brothers in a neat home on the city's east side. His home is conveniently located six blocks from his school and less than one block from the public library. With the library so close, it seems natural that Octavius is a regular visitor.

His mother encourages her sons to use the library, and they began visiting it soon after moving to this home two years ago. Octavius went to the library regularly during the school year. About once each week he went to look up information, check out books or do his homework. On some Saturday mornings he would bring his brothers to the library, so the house would be quiet and his mom could rest on her day off from work. The librarian recognizes Octavius as a regular library user, although they do not usually have conversations together during those visits.

During the summer he came to the library two or three times each week. These visits were related to several general purposes: to watch movies, to return or check out books, or to bring his younger brother to get books. When the summer reading program started in June, Octavius and his brother signed up in the first week. Although he frequented the library throughout the year, he first heard about the summer reading program at school. His friends "did it before me (last year) and told me, and then I started it."

He was an active first time participant in the program. During the first week he read 14 books, and he had accumulated the maximum 500 points by the end of the third week. He liked "getting points and the free things" that those points could buy. He spent some of his points as he went along and throughout the summer traded points for a variety of prizes: a paperback book, sunglasses, pencils, shoelaces, bookmarks, and free food coupons for ice cream cones, chicken sticks and a children's meal.

During the summer reading program Octavius read more than 30 books. His book choices covered a wide range -- both fiction and nonfiction as well as humor, history and sports. Many of these books were ones which could be read quickly. For example, he read a cartoon book (Look Out Behind You, Snoopy), a jokebook (The Dog House Joke Book) and several "time machine series books, e.g., Civil War Secret Agent, Sail with the Pirates. The "time machine series" are a type of choose-your-own-adventure book. Choices made throughout the book determine which portions of the book are read. Usually about one-third to one-half of a book's total pages are read.

Once Octavius completed his 500 points in the summer reading program, his own reading slowed considerably. Most of the books he read during the last half of the program (and approximately half of the total books he read) were "easy reader" books for young children. He read these to his three year old brother Marcus. Marcus "loves books and to have anyone read to him", so Octavius began checking out books for his younger brother in early July. This reading served a dual purpose since it earned summer reading program points for both boys.

Based on his own estimates and the amount of reading completed this summer, it seems likely that Octavius read two to four times each week. He often read at night or during the middle of the day "when it be real hot and I can't go outside until it cools down." He generally read all of a book he checked out, but might not finish a book if it was dull or boring or he was "tired, grumpy (and) not in the mood to read."

Octavius also did library reading which was not related to the summer reading program. He and his friend Tony sometimes went to the library for something to do and during such a visit would look through magazines. These magazines were on topics of interest to the boys: karate-kung-fu, BMX bicycle stunts, and ethnic magazines such as Ebony.

Octavius seemed to enjoy reading as a special event in his summer -- participating in the summer reading program -- rather than a continuous recreational habit. On a daily basis he preferred to spend his summer time in more active ways, such as building forts or playing ball with his friends or brothers. As the summer reading program ended, Octavius was headed off to camp for a week and was looking forward to the possibility of a family vacation to an amusement park. Reading had taken a backseat to other activities.

Sann

Sann, an exotically pretty girl with long dark hair and a flawless Oriental complexion, was only four years old when her family left their home in Cambodia, escaping first to Thailand and then to the United States. When she enrolled in an Indianapolis kindergarten a year later, Sann spoke only Cambodian.

Now, eight years later, Sann, her younger brother, mother, father, and two uncles live in a clean and neatly furnished home on the city's west side. A polite preteen, she has just completed the sixth grade and anticipates junior high school with a typical mix of eagerness and dread. Although her family life is strongly bicultural, she remembers little of her life in Cambodia and rarely speaks of any difficulties in adapting to life in this country.

Her spoken English is quite good today, and her teacher describes her as a "conscientious" student who is popular with her classmates. Her math test scores are exceptionally high, and she displays a talent for art. Reading, however, is a less-than-favorite activity for Sann, and her reading test scores are well below her scores in math.

Her parents want their children to be successful and emphasize the importance of reading and education. Sann's mother frequently tells her children to read and allows them to go to the library often throughout the year. Her father asks teachers to give extra assignments to help his children in school and sends them to summer school for "more learning" rather than "just playing all day long in the summer." But while her family thinks reading is important, there are few reading materials other than school or library books and little or no reading by the adults in her home.

She lives less than a mile from a public library and goes there once every week or two throughout the year. The librarian recognizes Sann and her brother, although the children seldom talk with the librarian. Although Sann knew about the summer reading program last year, she didn't know how to sign up. This year her friend told her about signing up. She and her brother registered early and read for six of the program's eight weeks. One of the reasons she gave for enrolling this year were the prizes, primarily some of the fast food prizes.

Library reading has more appeal for Sann than school reading. She likes picking her own books and throughout the summer demonstrated a particular interest in the books she chose. Each time she went to the library she selected several "series" books written for girls. Most commonly the books were from the Sweet Valley or Fabulous Five paperback book collections. She likes these books because they are "about things that happened to people like me." The general plots of the books are similar: a group of girl friends encountered a mystery or a problem which they then solved. Often the same characters are found in books of one series.

Sann received 225 points in the reading program for the 15 books she checked out of the library. The points were traded primarily for fast food prizes such as french fries and ice cream cones. Her disappointment with the reading program prizes came when she learned that things she liked -- a choice of salads and a book bag -- were for adults only.

Sann was not an avid reader, although she was routinely told by her mother to read. For example, she read about four of the 15 library books this summer completely and read parts of eight others. "Reading is okay, (but it's) not really fun. I'm a so-so reader and find reading kind of dull -- (it's) boring to read, read, read. I wouldn't be reading this summer if it weren't for the library's summer reading program."

This summer she estimates that she spent about an hour each week reading. This reading was almost entirely library books, since Sann does not read newspapers or magazines or have her own books. Although she states that "reading is not my thing", Sann sometimes reads just to have something to do. She prefers reading books with "excitement and romance" or about one of her interests "like how to sew clothes."

While checking out books and earning points in the library's program encouraged her reading this summer, these were not her only reasons for going to the library. She also attended two movies and sometimes went to the library with her friend for "something to do." Sann knew that her mother would usually allow her to go to the library, although she might say "no" to "do this or to do that" like going to a friend's house or going shopping.

As the summer ended, Sann found little time for reading and library visits. A family vacation to Boston to visit relatives filled nearly a week in August, and school was to begin soon after their return. Her seventh grade schedule arrived in the mail, and she was disappointed to discover that none of her sixth grade friends would be in her new classes. As summer ended, Sann was anxious for school to start so she would find out about junior high school first hand.

Lorie

Lorie, a sixth grader with beautiful red hair, did an impressive amount of reading this summer. Within the first week of the summer reading program she completed 14 books and had checked out nine more books to read. In all, she read all or part of 56 books within the two months of the summer reading program.

This was Lorie's second year in the program. Last year she learned about the program via a flyer included in her end-of-the-year report card, and she signed up with a friend. While she thought the program was fun, she didn't read enough last summer to completely fill her reading point card. This year she wanted to collect the maximum 500 points. Lorie easily accomplished this within the first month of the program. In fact, in just one library visit she collected 320 points for the books she read.

The nearest library was a 20 minute walk from Lorie's house, and Lorie made this walk about once a week if she was not able to find a ride. She made the effort because the summer reading program provided several motivations for her. She liked getting the points for prizes, especially the ice cream cones. Lorie spent some of her points as they were earned and saved some points to spend throughout the summer. In addition to ice cream cones, she selected prizes such as pencils, bookmarks, sunglasses and a fast food children's meal.

Lorie also liked the free choices associated with library reading. "School pressures you to read" while library books are your own choice. "At school you have to have (reading) done at that time (the teacher assigns it). With library reading you can read whenever." Besides, she viewed much of school reading as "boys' type of reading" -- "boring stuff...like Paul Bunyan, Star Wars, and scientific stuff" while she preferred reading stories about girls.

Another influence on her reading this summer was being a part of this study. Lorie's father stated that the "most important thing that's influenced her (reading) is being in this (case study) program with you. She didn't act like she was even interested in reading until she got in this program." Lorie also said that one of the best parts of the summer reading program was "being picked for this study."

Lorie has not received much positive reinforcement about her reading from school and home. She termed herself a bad reader because of her report card grades and her placement in the school's remedial reading lab. These perceptions seemed harsh considering that her grades were C's, and she recognized that "I was one of the highest students in reading lab." But report card comments from her teacher were not encouraging -- "Lorie could do much better... very lazy at times...she wastes a lot of time." Lorie felt that her parents echoed these sentiments. "Mom and dad don't think I read good. They're always saying you could do better than that."

Statements like these may have affected her attitude toward reading at school, although she like reading outside of school sometimes. "Reading can be fun. It's fun to solve mysteries on your own, and no one is telling you that you're reading wrong and stuff. Like in school they say, no, no, it's (a different word from what you said)."

Finding time for reading was sometimes a problem for Lorie. Early in the summer she was living with her aunt and uncle; "it was boring at my aunt's house," and she had more time for reading there. But in early July she moved home to live with her father, stepmother, older half-brother, younger half-brother and half-sister. Life in this home was busier, and Lorie said she "had too much to do when I moved home." As a result, she had less time for reading.

Despite her busy schedule of visiting relatives, watching TV and playing Nintendo, she still found time to read. Usually she read at night or in the car when she was traveling. Most of the time she read alone, but she also enjoyed reading to younger children, such as her first grade sister and neighbors in the first and third grades.

When selecting books for her own reading, Lorie had a very clear preference. She enjoyed "series" books, primarily those written for girls. She often selected books from the Sweet Valley High, Sweet Valley Twins, Babysitters' Club, Babysitters' Little Sister and Sleepover Friends collections. Twenty-six of the 56 books she read this summer were from these series.

Another series she enjoyed were the Berenstain Bears. Although these were much easier books than those Lorie usually read, she liked the characters and stories. One week she read 19 Berenstain Bear books just for the fun of it. Several of these were shared aloud with her sister.

As the summer reading program ended, so did Lorie's visits to the public library. During the school year she does not use the public library and instead uses the school library. But at school students are usually limited to checking out one book each, and the library does not have the series books she enjoys. Her school year and summer reading are quite different -- both in the amount and type of books selected.

General Discussion: Cross-case Analysis

Involvement with the public library: Most of the case study children exhibited one of three patterns of library use. Two children visited the library on a more or less weekly schedule throughout the year. Two other children went to the library frequently during the summer and also visited every two or three weeks during most of the school year. Two children used the public library only during the summer.

Only one boy had a unique pattern of library use. When he used the library throughout the year, his book-related visits were structured by others: his father encouraged his participation in the summer reading program, and his teacher brought his class to the library twice each month. His spontaneous visits to the library were of a social nature and not for the purpose of reading or using books.

Proximity to the library and familiarity with the library staff were examined. Three of the children lived within six blocks of a library and were all fairly active library users, while four children were a mile or more away from a library. Only one of those children could be described as an active library patron. Three children were on a first-name basis with their librarian. Two of these children used a branch library in a community center which was locally known for being "kid-centered;" these two children were among the more frequent library users. The third child well-known to his librarian always visited the library with his mother.

During the summer all of the children could be described as regular users of the library, although the frequency of use varied among the children. Two children visited the library every week to ten days; both of these girls lived a mile or more from the library. Two children visited the library on the same day each week throughout the summer reading program; external factors (e.g., movie day at the library) determined their schedules. Three children who lived close to their libraries often visited more than once each week. Five of the children usually came to the library alone or with a younger sibling, while library visits for two other children were regularly scheduled events with their mothers.

Reading and checking out books were not the only reasons these children visited their local library. Four children attended the summer movies -- two of these children had perfect attendance at the library's movie series. Two children brought younger siblings to the library to choose books, and four children made at least one socially-oriented visit to the library with friends during the summer. Four children sometimes went to the library "to have something to do" or "to get out of the house."

In general, it appears that the three children who lived closer to a library used it more frequently. All of the case studies were regular library users during the summer reading program, although two of them did not use the library other than in the summer. The children had several reasons for going to the library. Checking out books, reading books, seeing movies, visiting friends, bringing younger siblings to get books, and having something to do were among their reasons for going to the library.

Summer Reading Program: The seven children were unanimous on one aspect of the program: they all liked getting points for prizes. Beyond this point of consensus, there was variety in how they participated in the summer reading program. This variety was expressed in their years of program experience, access to information about the program, and how they earned and spent points.

The group was split between those with no prior experience and those returning for an additional summer in the library's program. Four of the children were participating for the first time, one girl was a second year participant, and two children had taken part in the program for five years. Besides being attracted to the incentives offered by the program, four children said they thought the program would help them keep or improve their reading skills over the summer.

They learned about the program in different ways. Two girls were influenced by friends to join, while another girl was signed up by her sister. Three other children learned about it at school: from a teacher, from a report card flyer, and from a class visit to the public library. The two children who have participated for five years knew about the program from the prior experience and their mothers. For these children the library's reading program has become an expected part of their summer.

The number of points earned by these children ranged from 190 to the maximum 500 points. Two of the children who earned 500 points did so within the first month of the program. There was not always a tight connection between the number of books read and the number of points received. For example, one child with 500 points logged that he had read eight books this summer. Two children read four books each; one child received 190 points, and the other child received 225 points. Part of this discrepancy may be the result of inaccurate reading logs, but there was verification from the children that the honor system regarding reading and incentive points was not always respected.

The children spent their points in different ways. Two children spent their points as they were earned, while two others spent some points as they were earned and saved other points until the end of the program. Three children saved their points and spent all of them in August. There were some similarities in how points were spent. The food prizes, especially the ice cream cones, were popular incentives among all of the children. However, only one boy spent all of his points for food. Most of the children spent their points for a variety of prizes. Only two of the children exchanged points for a paperback book, and three of the children complained about the shoelaces because they did not stay tied.

Amount and type of reading: There was great variety in the amount of reading done by the case study children as part of the summer reading program. Despite efforts to ensure accurate record-keeping by the children, the researcher was aware that the children's reading logs were not always meticulously maintained. For this reason, the amount of reading should be treated as a close estimate rather than an exact count for each child.

Nonetheless, there was a wide range in the amount of reading done by these seven children. This range included not only the books completed, but also the number of books logged as partially or completely read and the relative difficulty of those books for the reader. The following table summarizes amount of reading for the children in this part of the study:

Child	Completed	Books Logged	Relative Difficulty
Sann	2	8	on level
Walter	4	8	mix of on level/easy
Jason	4	12	easy reading
Ameesha	18	18	on level
Timmy	19	23	mix of on level/easy
Octavius	30	38	mix of on level/easy
Lorie	45	62	mix of on level/easy

For some children, the reading followed a discernible pattern. Three children read primarily "series" books -- a collection of books involving the same characters (e.g., the Babysitters Club series) or the same type of story line (e.g., choose your own adventure stories). Four children read only fiction, and two children read a variety of genre (including poetry, Bible stories, and history). Two children selected only books which were easy reading (i.e., limited text per page) or could be read quickly (e.g., a cartoon book).

The children's attitude toward their summer reading was primarily expressed by one of two phrases: "it's not my thing" (two children), and "it's fun sometimes" (four children). One child verbally expressed that he loved reading and thought reading was fun; however, he completed few books during the summer. The two children who expressed more negative attitudes also completed little reading this summer.

Home influences and Support: Several contradictions were noticed between home environments and expected impact on a child's reading. Two of the children came from homes which could be described as low literate environments. Magazines or newspapers were not available and there were few, if any, books in these homes. The adult(s) in these homes were not active reading models. Of the children from these homes, one girl read little this summer, and one girl was an active reader.

Two of the homes appeared to be highly literate environments. In these homes there were abundant reading materials (e.g., daily and Sunday newspapers, magazines, many books), and the adults in those homes were daily reading models. In addition, these parents emphasized the high value they place on being a good reader. However, the boys from these homes did little reading during the summer reading program.

The reading environment of the other three homes fell somewhere in between these extremes. In these homes there were some reading materials, but not in the combinations or quantities found in the highly literate homes. The adults in these homes varied in the reading role model set for the children. The three most active readers came from this set of homes.

Interactive reading was noted in four of the children's homes. Two children read regularly with their mothers. In one home this occurred several times each week, while in the other home it was a once or twice a week event. Four of the children read to younger children, although this activity was a regular event in only one case. In three of the homes, the children did not read with others.

The parents' roles in supporting their children's participation in the summer reading program also varied. Two parents registered for the program, made weekly trips to the library and read at home each week with their sons. One of these children completed an average of two to three books per week; one boy averaged one-half book per week. Three other parents stressed the importance of being a good reader to their children but were not actively involved in reading-related activities such as trips to the library or interactive reading. Two parents appeared to play no role in their children's involvement in the summer reading program. These two children were among the most active readers, completing 18 and 45 books as part of the summer reading program.

Summary: The uniqueness of each child as a case study continues to stand out during cross-case analysis. The children clearly liked earning prizes for the reading they did this summer, but a strong pattern characterizing low-achieving readers who read recreationally did not stand out across the case studies. However, the children dichotomized into two groups: four children who read a lot (completing 18 to 45 books), and three who read little (completing two to four books). These two groups were the focus for this summary.

When differentiating the active reader and inactive reader groups, no single activity or pattern distinguishes them. But as a group, the four active readers appeared to have personal motivations for reading during the library's 1990 summer program. The element which captured each child's interest and commitment was different. Ameesha was a confident reader whose success in reading reinforced the pleasure she found in books. Timmy and his mother shared books through a comfortable, supportive relationship which seemed to emphasize enjoyment. Octavius was an earnest young man who took his involvement in the summer reading program seriously. When he completed his own 500 points, he concentrated on reading (and earning points) for his younger brother who enjoyed books. Being part of this study made a big impression on Lorie; she read the series books she liked and enjoyed the attention shown in her reading.

On the other hand, the three inactive readers never got personally involved in reading or the library's program this summer. For Sann and Jason, their attitudes were a factor: reading just wasn't their thing. Walter seemed to be a passive participate in summer reading activities orchestrated by his mother. These three children could verbalize what they heard from their parents and teachers: it is important to be a good reader. But their actions did not show that they internalized this message. Little seemed to capture their interest or enjoyment of reading this summer. This difference between the active and inactive readers seems to emphasize the importance of intrinsic as well as extrinsic motivation.

APPENDIX C

References Cited

References Reviewed

Anderson, Carol M. (1977). Analysis of an Alternative Reading Strategy for Elementary Students. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED133688).

Anderson, R.C., Hiebert, E.H., Scott, J.A., & Wilkinson, I.A.G. (1985). Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the Commission on Reading. Champaign-Urbana, IL: Center for the Study of Reading.

Borg, W.R., & Gall, M.D. (1983). The methods and tools of survey research. In Educational research: An introduction (4th edition), p. 403-463. New York: Longman.

Brady, Mary Ella, & others (1980). Follow-up Testing Study. 1977-78. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED229313).

Brady, Mary Ella, & others (1980). Follow-up Testing Study. 1977-78. Final Report. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED181064).

Carter, Vivian (1988). "The effect of summer reading program participation on the retention of reading skills." Illinois Libraries, January, 1988, p. 56-60. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ370696).

Converse, J.M., & Presser, S. (1986). Survey questions: Handcrafting the standardized questionnaire. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Crowell, Doris C., & Klein, Thomas W. (1981). "Preventing summer loss of reading skills among primary children." Reading Teacher, February, 1981, p. 561-64. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ240277).

Duncan, P.H., & Goggin, W.F. (1982). A profile of liifteime readers: Implication for instruction and resource utilization. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the College Reading Association: Philadelphia, PA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED223994).

Dunne, J.G., & McGrath, M.R. (1985). Listen to me! I want to tell you something!. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED262372).

Durkin, D. (1982). A study of poor black children who are successful readers. Reading Education Report #33. Champaign-Urbana, IL: Center for the Study of Reading. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 216334).

Fowler, F.J., Jr. (1984). Survey research methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Gastright, J.F. (1979). Summer Loss in Reading Achievement: A Comparison of Fall to Spring Reading Achievement Gains with Fall to Fall Reading Achievement Gains. Cincinnati, Ohio: Cincinnati Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED179930).

Goetz, J.P., & LeCompte, M.D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Greany, V. (1980). Factors related to amount and type of leisure time reading. Reading Research Quarterly, 15, p. 337-357.

Hansen, H.S. (1969). The impact of the home literary environment on reading attitude. Elementary English, 46, p. 17-24.

Hansen, Joe B., & others (1986). Elementary Summer School, 1985 Program in the Portland Public Schools. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED273662).

Johnston, A.M. (1988). Encouraging third grade students to participate in recreational reading through attitude improvement and motivational techniques. (Doctoral practicum, Nova University, 1988). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 306544).

Kemmerer, F. (1980). Towards specification of a student time supply function. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41/09A, p. 3786.

Kemp, L.A. (1982). The relationship of selected factors the independent reading of elementary school children. (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43/03A, p. 664.

Klibanoff, L.S., & Haggart, S.A. (1982). Summer Growth and Klibanoff, L. S., & Haggart, S.A. (1982). Summer Growth and the Effectiveness of Summer School. Technical Report #8 from the Study of the Sustaining Effects of Compensatory Education on Basic Skills. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED213789).

Langer, J.A., Applebee, A.N., Mullis, I.V.S., and Foertsch, M.A. (1990). Learning to read in our nation's schools: Instruction and achievement in 1988 at grades 4, 8, and 12. Princeton, NJ: National Assessment of Educational Progress, Educational Testing Service.

Lavrakas, P.J. (1987). Telephone survey methods: Sampling, selection, and supervision. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). Natiralistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Lockledge, A., & Marheny;m C. (1987). Looking toward the family: Case studies of lifelong readers. Paper presented at 1987 International Reading Association Conference: Anaheim, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 283140).

McCormick, Christin, & Mason, Jana (1982). What Happens to Kindergarten Children's Knowledge about Reading after a Summer Vacation? Reading Education Report No. 21. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED205911).

Merriam, S.B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Fancisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

National Assessment of Educational Progress (1985). The Reading Report Card: Progress toward excellence in our schools: Trends over four national assessments, 1971-1984. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. National Institute of Education.

Opperman, Prudence, & others (1983). The 1982-83 Promotional Gates Program: Mid-Year Assessment and Analysis of August, 1982 and January, 1983 Test Results. New York, N.Y.: New York City Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED237597).

Pablo, E.R. (1986). Factors that promote the development of a permanent interest in reading. Paper presented at the 6th Annual Symposium on Reading, Mangilao, Guam, 1986. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 266427).

Perez, Samuel A. (1979). The Effects of the Summer Vacation on Reading Retention. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED158243).

Perkins, Mary Ellen (1966). The Effects of a Summer Reading Program on Culturally Disadvantaged Children of First, Second, and Third Grades. (Doctoral dissertation: University of Minnesota, 1966). Dissertation Abstracts International.

Stahlschmidt, A.D. (1981). A study of recreational book reading habits of selected fifth grade children. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42/07A, p. 3009.

Strickland, D., & Taylor, D. (1989). Family storybook reading: Implications for children, families, and curriculum. In D.S. Strickland and L.M. Morrow (Eds.) Emerging literacy: Young children learn to reading and write (p. 27-35). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Stronks, G.G. (1981). The relationship between the amount of book reading of adults aged sixty to sixty-four and selected psychological, sociological, and environmental factors. (Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42/08A, p. 3529.

Talan, C.S. (1980). A correlative analysis of reading achievement, reading attitude, home literary environement, and self-concept in the middle school. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41/05A, p. 2040.

Taylor, D., & Dorsey-Gaines, C. (1988). GRowing up literate: Learning from inner-city families. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Thompson, M.E. (1987). What happens when readers do not read? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the North Central Reading Association, University of Notre Dame, 1987. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 286165).

Wigfield, A., & Asher, S.R. (1984). Social and motivational influences on reading. In P.D. Pearson (Ed.), Handbook of Reading Research (pp. 423-452). White Plains, NY: Longman, Inc.

Woolf, S.J. (1980). Relationship of family structure and leisure-time activities to middle school students' voluntary reading. (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41/06A, p.226.

Yin, R.K. (1989). Case study research: Design and methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.